United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013 No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

REFORM OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for continued reforms to our health care system. The Affordable Care Act was a huge step in the right direction, but we can do more because the path we are on is unsustainable.

The U.S. spends approximately 18 percent of its GDP on health—close to twice as much as other developed Nations—and yet we don't have better health care outcomes. Health care costs are rising faster than inflation and wages, meaning they are eating a larger portion of Americans' paychecks and the government's budget.

If we continue on our current path, the Medicare trust fund will be insolvent by 2024. And Medicare and Medicaid will grow from 24 percent of the Federal budget to almost 30 percent, crowding out other needed investments.

We have to reduce health care costs in both the private sector and the public sector in order to ensure America remains competitive in the global market. But there is a right way to reform our health care system and there is a wrong way. With all due respect, Mr. RYAN's plan is the wrong way.

Mr. RYAN's plan for Medicare and Medicaid misses the point. His solution simply shifts the costs from the government to patients, rather than reducing health care costs. Under the Ryan budget, seniors would pay as much as $1,200 more each year by 2030, and $6,000 more by 2050. For over half of Medicare beneficiaries with incomes less than $21,000, a $1,200 increase is a huge piece of their budget.

He also proposes block-granting Medicaid, which would cut Medicaid funding by approximately $700 billion over the next decade and result in 14 to 19 million people being kicked off Medicaid, many of them children and seniors.

These steps might make the budget look better, but they do nothing to actually reduce the cost of health care, and they hurt patients. We can reduce health care costs without harming beneficiaries.

Here are five steps we should take to reduce health care costs the right way:

First, and most importantly, we have to change the way we pay providers. Right now, we pay for each individual test and surgery. We pay for quantity rather than quality of care. Providers across the country are adopting payment for quality models, but they need Medicare, the largest payer, to get on board and pay for quality as well.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, or CMS, just completed a pilot where it bundled payments for 37 procedures and reduced spending by 10 percent. This needs to be replicated across the board, and CMS needs to move the majority of its patients to physicians off fee-for-service over the next 10 years.

Second, CMS needs to restructure and expand competitive bidding. It just completed a competitive bidding pilot for durable medical equipment and was able to reduce prices by double digits. While I have some concerns about the structure of that competitive bidding program, I believe it does need to be restructured to prevent suicide bidding and expanded to include more medical tests and services such as lab tests, CT scanners, and other items.

Third, States need to be empowered and incentivized to reduce their health care costs. States like Arkansas have taken bold steps to reduce their health care costs by requiring their two largest insurers and their Medicaid program to join a shared savings plan. They are expected to save the State's Medicaid program $4.4 million in FY '13 and $9.3 million in FY '14. We should be encouraging other States to follow the path of Arkansas and reduce Medicaid costs and improve care.

Fourth, we have to modernize Medicare cost sharing and ask a bit more from those who can afford it. We should combine Medicare part A and B deductibles and cap them. We should increase means testing for premiums for part B. And we should limit first-dollar coverage for high earners. We have to protect our sickest seniors from high costs while asking a bit more from those with greater means.

Finally, we have to improve price and quality transparency. We should prohibit gag clauses, which currently

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

prevent hospitals from sharing health care pricing information. Without pricing transparency, hospitals can't negotiate for the best price for medical devices and physicians can't make cost-conscious choices for their patients.

We do have to reduce health care costs, but there is a right way to do it and there is a wrong way. Mr. RYAN's plan is the wrong path. It harms seniors and fails to reduce underlying health care costs. By pursuing the five proposals I just outlined, we can reduce costs and improve quality, strengthening both our budget and our citizens.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 10-year anniversary of the start of combat operations in Iraq. Most of discussion in this town focuses on politicians, pundits, and writers. And while I don't begrudge people the ability to indulge in those types of debates, I do think what has been missing is a tribute to the sacrifices that have been made by American servicemembers.

Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War wrote:

> This extraordinary war in which we are engaged falls heavily upon all classes of people, but most heavily upon the soldier. For it has been said, all that a man hath will he give for his life; and while all contribute of their substance the soldier puts his life at stake, and often yields it up in his country's cause. The highest merit then is due to the soldier.

The Iraq conflict is much different than the Civil War. One of the ways it is different is that the burdens fell perhaps even more directly on our American servicemen and -women. After all, we did not have, and do not have, a military draft.

Most of the folks who were going over there volunteered, and a lot of them knowing that they would be sent to places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of our servicemembers did multiple combat tours, not just for 4 months or 6 months, but 12 months and 15 months, in very hazardous duties.

And what did they volunteer for? This was not a piece of cake. These were very difficult fights against an enemy that by and large dared not show its face. The enemy preferred to blend into civilian society and wreak havoc with improvised explosive devices and suicide vests. This was a daily reality for our men and women who were on the ground during this period.

When direct combat operations did occur between U.S. forces and the enemy, they were often fierce fights in urban centers in the streets of cities like Ramadi and Baghdad.

And, of course, being on multiple deployments and being gone for so long provided the opportunity for a lot of stress on families. It is difficult to be in a situation where you are missing a holiday. Some of our troops had to miss multiple holidays over multiple years. That is a sacrifice both for the folks who have to be back home but also for the troops who are on the front lines.

So Lincoln said: ''The highest merit is due to the soldier.'' Indeed.

As we look back on the 10th anniversary of Iraq, what we see are soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who were given the most difficult of tasks and yet they discharged their duties with courage and skill. Henceforth, nobody will be able to recount the great feats of some of our services, such as the Marine Corps, from the shores of Tripoli to Belleau Wood to Guadalcanal, without also mentioning the great feats performed by brave marines in places like Fallujah.

□ 1010

When recounting the unparalleled skill of our Special Operations Forces, credit will have to be given to those Navy SEALs who ruled the night during Iraq's most perilous moments.

So, for braving the storms of war with honor, tenacity and distinction, we thank you, the American servicemember, for the sacrifices you made on behalf of our country; and for those who gave the last full measure of devotion, you have earned a place in the pantheon of America's greatest heroes. We thank you for your service and your sacrifice.

THE CREATION OF A COMMISSION ON HEALING THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WOUNDS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, after a painful decade of war, the United States needs to take the time to regain its equilibrium and find peace. Without a formal process for acknowledging the physical and psychological costs of war, our collective trauma can undermine our country for decades.

As Ernest Hemingway wrote:

> The killing is necessary, I know, but still the doing of it is very bad for a man, and I think that, after all this is over and we have won the war, there must be a penance of some kind for the cleansing of us all.

War involves staggering amounts of loss and—equally important—of killing. Despite great efforts by our soldiers to protect civilians, an overwhelming majority of casualties in modern war are innocent people. This incurs a deep spiritual and emotional cost to those who witness it and are sometimes responsible for it. Many initiatives exist that provide help for the men and women who have fought, but we must go beyond the policy initiatives. Soldiers returning from war need to share their experiences and unburden their souls.

Our soldiers volunteered to serve their country in war, but they did not volunteer to take over the entire moral burden that comes with it. Our Nation needs to discuss the complicated spiritual and emotional obstacles faced by any society that has waged war. This is not a partisan debate about the rightness or wrongness of war. This is a national effort to take care of our soldiers by publicly sharing some of their burdens. We must be willing to explore the responsibility that comes with asking them to fight.

In preindustrial societies, leaders were intimately involved in war, itself—often with a sword in hand—and religious and spiritual leaders were fully engaged in the aftermath. Rituals and ceremonies decommissioned the fighters and made the entire community conscious of the sacrifice. These processes are missing today, and they remain vitally important. The agony suffered by our veterans is vivid testimony: 22 veterans commit suicide every day while an average of almost one active duty soldier a day took his or her life in 2012. That's higher than in combat. Many other soldiers suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder, become addicted to drugs and alcohol, or fall into violence and prison.

If a society fails to address these emotional and moral issues publicly, soldiers and vets will struggle with them privately. Many of them will lose that struggle and leave us all affected by their loss.

The Nation requires concrete ways to address the wounds of the war. We need a national day of solemn ceremonies that acknowledge the costs in lives, trauma, lost limbs, families, a renewed commitment to the social and health issues of veterans, a discussion about national service for young, nonmilitary Americans, and a systematic interaction between combat veterans and civilians.

I worked with Karl Marlantes, who wrote the book ''What It Is Like to Go to War,'' and with Sebastian Junger, who did the documentary called ''Restrepo,'' which was about Afghanistan, in order to create this bill that would address these issues. We propose a commission to examine and articulate the spiritual challenges and to help heal the psychological wounds faced by a Nation emerging from a decade of war.

We call on the President, on the Senate majority and minority leaders, and on the House Speaker and minority leader to appoint a group of distinguished citizens to explore ways to heal this society. The committee should include veterans, spiritual leaders, psychologists, journalists, maybe even a poet. It should strive to reach beyond the politics of war and into the true moral and emotional consequences that violence always incurs. It may be hard for us, but we must do it if we are to remain a humane society.

Some see things as they are and ask why. I dream of things as they never were. The question we must ask now is: Why can't we do for our soldiers what needs to be done? They need to be taken home and received and understood by the populace for what they went and did for us.

THE RYAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House budget plan that is on the floor today. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this positive blueprint for our future.

Much has been said about a balanced budget over the past couple of weeks; and while it is important to point out that the House budget balances in 10 years while the Senate's budget never balances, I believe the more important point is why we believe our budget must balance.

A balanced budget is critically important to all Americans and to the future of our great country.

We must balance our budget for our senior citizens, who deserve to have security in their retirements. A balanced budget will strengthen critical retirement programs so our seniors are assured that Medicare and Social Security will continue to be there for them and for their children.

We must balance our budget for our hardworking mothers and fathers across our country. A balanced budget is fundamental to a healthy and robust economy that creates good jobs that the American people need to support their families.

We must balance our budget for our students. Those who are currently in our universities and in our community colleges should feel confident that an investment in their education will lead them to good-paying jobs when they graduate. A balanced budget gives them that confidence that their futures will not be threatened by staggering debt.

Most importantly, we must balance our budget for our children and our grandchildren, who deserve the same chance at the American Dream that we have been given. Rather than handing them the bill for this generation's irresponsibility, a balanced budget will allow us to hand them a brighter future, an American future.

Our balanced budget represents a departure from the status quo here in Washington, and it represents the House Republicans' commitment to moving our Nation forward in a fiscally responsible way. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

AMERICA AND GREECE—STRENGTH IN SOLIDARITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 192nd anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Greece and America are history's most storied democracies. Our Founding Fathers borrowed heavily from Greek antiquity to build American democracy. Our relationship with Greece, however, is more than one just of philosophical kinship. America, Greece, and Greek Americans have stood in solidarity since the founding of the United States.

In this year, when we also celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, and the 100th anniversary of both Harriet Tubman's death and Rosa Parks' birth, it is especially fitting to recall how Hellenes and African Americans have reached out to one another to provide mutual support.

When Hellenes acted to liberate themselves in 1821, James Williams, an African American sailor from my hometown of Baltimore, joined the Greek revolutionary navy and fought at the Battle of Navarino. In turn, John Zachos and Photius Fisk, orphans of the Greek War of Independence, became passionate abolitionists in America. Zachos was a member of the Educational Commission of Boston and New York. Fisk, a U.S. Navy chaplain, helped slaves find freedom by supporting the Underground Railroad.

In 1922, recently arrived Greek immigrants organized the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in Georgia to defend themselves against the Ku Klux Klan. AHEPA went on to help countless Greek immigrants assimilate into American society, and it weighed in on many of the most significant social issues of our time, including the movement for civil rights. Archbishop Iakovos, leader of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, carried that commitment forward when he marched alongside Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, Alabama, in 1965. An iconic photograph of those two great leaders appeared on the cover of Life Magazine.

The historical relationship of these two proud communities embodies the greatness of America. On March 25, when we celebrate Greek Independence Day, we salute all those who have struggled for freedom, and we rededicate ourselves to ensuring that America remains a symbol of fairness and opportunity the world over.

□ 1020

I rise today also to mourn the passing of the legendary Greek American, Andrew A. Athens of Chicago.

Andy lived a life that few could match. He enlisted in the U.S. Army in January of 1942 and fought at the famous Battle of El Alamein in Egypt. He attained the rank of captain, and in 1945 was honored with the Bronze Star and the U.S. Army Commendation Medal for his outstanding military service. Andy went on to become a successful businessman and walked with kings and commoners, spreading the high ideals and values of Hellenism.

Andy was at the forefront of organizing Greek Americans in their pursuit of justice for Cyprus and freedom for the Ecumenical Patriarchate. And in so many of what for him became routine endeavors, he embodied Hellenism in the public service by giving back to the broader American society. Whether it was AHEPA, the Order of St. Andrew, or organizations he founded such as the United Hellenic American Congress and Hellenicare, the scope of Andy's commitment to a myriad of important causes was breathtaking. He combined a gentleness of spirit with a fierce determination to make a difference. Andy's heart was always full as he gave graciously of his time and resources to make this world a better place.

Above all, Andy Athens had a deep commitment to family. His beloved wife of 67 years, Louise, and Andy's entire family are in our thoughts. May his memory be ever eternal.

A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget, a balanced budget. Let me be very, very clear about this. A balanced budget means jobs. Again, a balanced budget means jobs.

Think about this for a second. Your family at home, you balance your budget; why can't Washington? Businesses balance their budget; why can't Washington? And House Republicans today, all we're asking is to balance the budget in 10 years. Think about this. If you have a 10-year-old, by the time we balance the budget, your 10-year-old will basically be almost done with college.

So in a bipartisan fashion, I would say look at the 1990s. Let's look at President Bill Clinton who balanced the budget with a Republican-controlled House, opportunity and jobs ran rampant. We need to return to that today. So we're asking this President, Please, work with us, Mr. President. But what is worse in all of this is how Senate Democrats have failed to serve you. The last time that they even passed a budget was before the iPad existed—before the iPad existed.

We're willing to compromise; we're willing to work with people. But how can we work with Senate Democrats when they're not working at all? They're not doing their job at all to serve you, the American people. Their budget right now that they're working on does nothing more than raise taxes. They want more of your money, more money out of your paycheck. Ask yourself, does Washington really need more of your money?

We're $16 trillion in debt. We have deficits that we can't even wrap our arms around, and they want more of your money. If you had a financial adviser that put you a million dollars in debt and then ripped through your savings for your children's college education and all of your checking account and said, ''Yeah, just give me some more money and we'll solve the problem,'' would you do it? Absolutely not.

More than jobs, though, we're also working to save Medicare and Social Security, the commitments that we have made to the American people. So let's take a look here at the big picture. Here's a budget breakdown of where we're at right now. Look, your eyes will glaze over when we start talking about the trillions of dollars that we spend. But let's take a look at what you pay versus what you expect.

This blue part right here is on autopilot. No adults have come to the table to talk about where we're at today and how to actually save your Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid in this big blue part. We're doing that today, House Republicans, in balancing the budget. But this is what you expect from the Federal Government: your education, roads, bridges, a healthy environment, and what's mandated by the Constitution, our Armed Forces to protect us.

But this is where it gets really scary. All of this blue part here for Medicare and Social Security is what we take in. In other words, all of our cash on hand, if you will, the money that you pay the Federal Government every time you get a paycheck or pay your income taxes, this is all devoted to Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security. In other words, everything else—your education, the environment, our roads, bridges, ports, Armed Forces—all of that money to pay for that basically is borrowed. It's borrowed—or worse, just printed.

This is the sad reality that we're facing today. But with Republican House leadership and working with Democrats who are actually willing to come to the table and compromise—and not just work with us, work for you—we can save Social Security and Medicare.

And by the way, when you hear Democrats or you see the videos of them throwing your grandmother off a cliff or telling you that Republicans just want to cut, cut, cut, no; this is about save, save, save. And in the words of a hip-hop band from my generation, Public Enemy: don't believe the hype.

House Republicans are working today for you. We're working to save Social Security and Medicare. We're working to save this economy and, ultimately, this country for you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and commemorate the 192nd anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Like the American revolutionaries who fought for independence and established this great Republic we call the land of the free and the home of the brave, Greek freedom fighters similarly began an arduous struggle to win independence for Greece and its people 192 years ago on March 25.

The Greeks faced four centuries of Ottoman oppression, a David versus Goliath situation, if you will. Beginning their revolution on March 25 was no coincidence. This was the holy day dedicated to the mother of God, Theotokos; and as such, they had their champion, their savior, and their protector by their side. As Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of revolution over the Monastery of Agia Lavra in the Peloponnese, ''Eleftheria i Thanatos''—Liberty or Death—became their battle cry.

As is true in our own country, the price of freedom was great, with brave men and women fighting for God and country in the hope of a better world for future generations.

Our Greek brothers sacrificed much for their independence, and there are many stories which I could share to demonstrate the heroism they exhibited. Most Greeks will remember that of Athanasios Diakos, legendary hero, priest, patriot, and soldier who led 500 of his men in a notable stand against 8,000 Ottoman Turk soldiers. While Diakos' men were wiped out and he fell to enemy hands which tortured him before his death, he became the image for Greeks to give all for love of faith and homeland. May his memory be eternal, Mr. Speaker.

The revolution brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. It proved a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. And it is a sentiment which can still be found among Greeks today.

Greek soldiers served alongside Americans in World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. They've always been our allies, Mr. Speaker, and continue to be today.

This week, the joint naval exercise Noble Dina is expected to conclude. And for the 3rd year, the navies representing the United States, Greece, and Israel have come together to engage in maritime evacuations and search and rescue drills, a symbol of the ongoing and growing friendships between the countries.

□ 1030

The lessons the Greeks taught us in 1821 continue to provide strength to victims of persecution throughout the world today. By honoring the Greek struggle for independence, we reaffirm the values and ideas that make America great.

Each time I perform my constitutional duties, I am doing so in the legacy of our American forefathers and the ancient Greeks. As Thomas Jefferson once said, ''To the ancient Greeks, we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, American colonists, out of gothic darkness.''

We celebrate Greek Independence Day to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. And, as Americans, we must continue to pursue this spirit of freedom and liberty, which characterizes both great nations.

Zito i Ellas. Long live Greece.

TRIBUTE TO THE SERVICE OF CAPTAIN ANDREW S. WHITSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate an exceptional naval officer, Captain Andrew Shepard Whitson, at the completion of 30 years of distinguished naval service, culminating as the Director of the U.S. House of Representatives Liaison Office for the Department of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs.

I'm honored to commend Captain Whitson's achievements and recognize his service and devotion to our great country.

A 1983 graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, Captain Whitson earned his wings in 1985 and was designated a naval aviator. He sailed around the world, flying the F–14 Tomcat and F/A–18 Hornets. He's served in five fighter squadrons, participating in multiple combat operations during Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was also recognized as the ''East Coast Fighter Pilot of the Year'' in 1997.

Captain Whitson served as the executive officer and commanding officer of the Bounty Hunters of Fighter Squadron Two, leading them through two deployments aboard USS *Constellation* (CV–64), including the combat operations in Iraqi Freedom. In 2009 and 2010, he served as the commander of Carrier Air Wing 17.

Captain Whitson is retiring after 30 years of honorable service to this Nation. His professional success would not have been possible without the support of his wife, Tracy—I've had the privilege of getting to know Captain Whitson and his family—and his lovely daughter, Alexandra. Their shared sacrifice is a credit to their personal character.

I wish Captain Whitson continued success and fulfillment as he transitions to civilian life after three decades of exceptional service to our country. His loyal dedication to duty reflects the highest standards of naval service.

I hold him in high personal regard and consider it a privilege to call Captain Whitson my friend. And I'm delighted that he and his family call Virginia's Second Congressional District their home.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my fellow colleagues this morning join me, all

Members of the House, in saluting this outstanding naval officer and wishing him and his wonderful family fair winds and following seas.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF GREECE'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. As cochair and cofounder of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I rise today to celebrate the 192nd anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Against incredibly difficult odds, the Greeks defeated one of the most powerful empires in history to win their independence. Following 400 years of Ottoman rule, in March 1821, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the traditional Greek flag at the monastery of Agia Lavras, inciting his countrymen to rise up against the Ottoman army.

The bishop timed this act of revolution to coincide with the Greek Orthodox holiday celebrating the Archangel Gabriel's announcement that the Virgin Mary was about to give birth with the divine child. Bishop Germanos' message to his people was clear: A new spirit was about to be born in Greece. The following year, the Treaty of Constantinople established full independence for Greece.

New York City is home to one of the largest Hellenic populations outside Greece and Cyprus. Astoria, Queens, which I have the honor of representing, is often called ''Little Athens'' because of the large Hellenic population in that neighborhood.

New Yorkers celebrate Greek Independence Day with a parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, which I have been honored to participate in year after year. Marching side-by-side with my Greek-American friends, I have always been overwhelmed by the warmth and enthusiasm which the community has brought to New York City. These events remind us of the Hellenic-American community's many contributions to our Nation's history and culture.

The friendship between America and Greece is based on mutual respect, a commitment to common goals, and a sharing of fundamental values, especially ensuring stability in southeastern Europe. I hope permanent solutions can be found for ending the divisions of Cyprus and finding a mutually agreeable name for the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia.

I know that the Greek independence movement was an inspiration to the American independence movement, and we have learned so much from our Greek friends.

I have introduced, in many Congresses, an important resolution with my caucus cochair, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS. This resolution urges Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the ecumenical patriarch. It was my privilege to meet with the patriarch last year, and I know that he is negotiating with the Turkish government for the return to Halki, the Greek Orthodox seminary, of the right and independence to educate their priests and to restore their lands to them.

I want to say that I ask all of my colleagues to join me and Members of Congress in celebrating Greece's independence. It is also my sincere pleasure to pay tribute to New York's Hellenic-American community for its many contributions to our great country.

Zeto e eleftheria. Long live freedom.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again today in support of Yucca Mountain in Nye County, Nevada, which, by law, is designated as the site for a permanent geological repository for our Nation's spent nuclear fuel.

Last year, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future issued a report, but barred even evaluating the merits of Yucca Mountain, despite the fact that it has been approved on a bipartisan basis by Congress and signed into law by the President, and actually reaffirmed by signing the law in 2002. The initial law was passed in 1982, and the law was amended in 1987, which, in a bipartisan manner, passed through both Chambers, signed by different Presidents, established that Yucca Mountain would be the repository for our nuclear spent fuel.

What the Blue Ribbon Commission did say was any host community should expect incentives. That commitment is no different from Nevada when it comes to Yucca Mountain. And good news: the local county, Nye County, Nevada, is consenting and ready to negotiate with the Department of Energy.

In advance of Yucca Mountain even receiving its first delivery, we will work with the State, Nye County, and surrounding communities to provide incentives to benefit the people of Nevada and their communities. We will address infrastructure needs, provide additional ground water monitoring, and build rail spurs, providing benefits outside of the Yucca Mountain project.

As we look to make nuclear processing viable in the future, we can establish research dollars to universities in the State to be leaders in this field, and we will work to develop these and other ideas from State and local leaders to best fit their needs.

This will mean thousands of direct or indirect jobs across the State of Nevada. Before any of these incentives are even discussed, we know from DOE in the past that the project would yield over 2,500 direct jobs on its own for more than 25 years under the current permit. Even after 50 years, as the project winds down, there would still be more than 500 direct jobs.

□ 1040

Construction of a rail spur could require an additional 1,000 workers and 300 permanent jobs for decades to come. All told, with indirect jobs and the project alone, conservative estimates project 7,000 new jobs in Nevada, not even counting those associated with other incentives we in Congress are prepared to work with the State and local communities to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move forward on finishing the licensing application on Yucca Mountain, as required by law. Let the science speak for itself that says Yucca Mountain meets a million-year safety standard so it can serve as a national asset that develops thousands of badly needed jobs in Nevada's struggling economy.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Monsignor Robert Kurwicki, Cathedral of Saint Joseph, Jefferson City, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

O gracious and merciful God, so great and everlasting, we come before You today with our hearts filled with sincere love and true devotion. Now grant us, in this, the people's House, a spirit of justice and goodwill in order that the important work of this day may be carried out in truth and charity.

We know that, by our own strength, we will falter and fail. Yet we have a hope that You will never leave us or forget us in Your great shepherd's care. We are serious as we recommit ourselves to You and to Your goals. Show us the way to perfection.

Bless these elected Members, their families, staffs, and constituents in a special way this day, in order that they may continue to reach for the highest, noblest, and greatest benefits for this Nation.

And the House says, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING MONSIGNOR ROBERT KURWICKI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to introduce Monsignor Robert A. Kurwicki as an esteemed guest to deliver the opening prayer of the United States House of Representatives.

Monsignor Kurwicki is the Reverend Monsignor of the Cathedral of Saint Joseph in Jefferson City, Missouri. The monsignor has served the great State of Missouri as the chaplain of the Missouri House of Representatives since 2011, a position in which he is responsible for leading the members of the State house in prayer and helping to improve the strong tradition of faith in our capitol in Missouri.

In addition to his important role in the Missouri House of Representatives, he is also a member of the Priests Senate and Vice-Chancellor of the Diocese of Jefferson City. Monsignor Kurwicki is and has been a tremendous spiritual influence, not only to myself and my family, but also the Third District, as well as the entire State of Missouri.

It is an honor to welcome him here to Congress and thank him for his invaluable service to our community and our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSON). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will vote on the House Republican budget resolution. This will be the third straight year that the House will pass a budget. The budget is not just a plan for this coming fiscal year, but it's also a plan to balance our budget in this Nation in 10 years.

The national debt is now $16.7 trillion. That works out to about a $147,000 of debt per taxpayer. Our Nation cannot continue to spend and borrow at this rate. The House Republican budget tackles our spending problems head-on, while protecting our military from indiscriminate cuts.

It also outlines a plan to reform our burdensome Tax Code. By getting spending under control and reforming our Tax Code, this budget would help create jobs, and that's exactly what our economy needs right now.

Congress has a responsibility to future generations to get the budget balanced, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this effort.

FALSE CHOICES

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the budget proposals on both sides of the aisle that are before the House this week.

Folks in Washington are good at giving the American people false choices. Today, we're forced to choose between budgets that cut Medicare benefits and budgets that unnecessarily raise taxes.

Folks in my district in Georgia have had enough of these false choices. We need to cut spending on things we don't need and can't afford, balance the budget, and lower taxes on all families; but there are no proposals to do that.

Each time we come to the House floor to deal with a budget, both sides are focused on messaging, not solutions. The people in my district deserve better. It's time for Congress to develop a responsible budget that cuts the deficit, protects Medicare and Social Security, and lowers taxes by fully reforming our outdated Tax Code.

PATH TO PROSPERITY

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will consider the Path to Prosperity budget, reaffirming, once again, that the House Republicans are the only ones in Washington offering serious solutions to government's spending-driven debt crisis.

Americans at home must prepare a balanced budget for themselves and their families. Our plan would bring the same common sense to Washington once the budget is balanced over the next decade.

Our budget is not balanced by raising taxes on hardworking Americans, but by responsibly reducing spending on government waste and reforming mandatory spending to ensure that programs on which Americans rely remain strong for decades to come.

Our budget saves taxpayers $4.6 trillion over the next decade. The Senate Democrat budget, however, calls for $1.5 trillion in new taxes and $7.3 trillion in new debt.

America, Mr. Speaker, deserves better. That's why the House Republicans have proposed the Path to Prosperity to get our economy back on track and create more jobs and opportunities for more Americans.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the ocean levels are rising. The ice cap is melting. Severe storms, more intense and more frequent. Climate change is real, not that you'd know it in this body. We're still having a debate about the reality. This is a fact-free zone in Congress when it comes to climate change. But we can still make progress, even if we debate the science.

We should do things that allow all of us to use less energy. Energy efficiency is good, regardless of what fuel source you use. It creates jobs for the folks who are out of work in the home construction industry, doing retrofits for commercial and residential buildings. It saves families money, and it saves businesses money.

There's an enormous amount of advocacy on both sides of the aisle to do this practical, commonsense step. It will have an incidental benefit, as well, of reducing carbon emissions.

So even as we have an unresolved debate about the science of climate change, let's take practical steps that are good for jobs, good for the economy, and good for saving taxpayers money.

THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE START OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 10th anniversary for the war in Iraq that began with the United States-led invasion on March 20, 2003.

In 2005, I resigned from public office in the State of Colorado to return to Active Duty in the United States Marine Corps for assignment in Iraq. I did this, not because I believed that the invasion of Iraq was the right decision for our country, but because I strongly believed that, once the decision had been made to go into Iraq, that we had a responsibility to bring this war to a just conclusion.

I can't say enough about the young men and women of our military whom I met in Iraq when I served there and observed their courage, their determination to succeed under very challenging conditions, and their extraordinary sacrifices.

However, now that I'm a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I will do everything I can to make sure that our country never goes down this path again. Nation-building operations, where we invade, pacify and administer whole countries, is the wrong direction for America and must never be repeated again.

□ 1210

REPEAL THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee will hold a hearing on sequestration's effect on implementing safety regulations at the Federal Aviation Administration. This is an important reminder that critical deadlines for the release of rules regarding pilot qualifications and training are fast approaching.

Just over 4 years ago, dozens of lives were lost as Continental Flight 3407 crashed in my western New York community. Since then, the families and friends of these victims have made countless visits to Washington, D.C., and advocated to ensure that what happened to their loved ones will never be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot lose focus and allow further delays to the completion of these already long-overdue rules. I urge Congress to repeal the sequester for the safety of our flying public.

THREE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week marks an anniversary that doesn't warrant celebration. Three years ago, President Obama's takeover of health care was signed into law.

This mountain of stacked paper represents the 20,000 pages of new regulations in President Obama's new health care law. Each regulation represents another shackle on America's small businesses—our job creators. But don't take my word for it. Just ask the folks at two of Ohio's home health care employers, Interim Health Care in Bridgeport, who employs 300 hardworking Ohioans, or Comfort Keepers in East Liverpool, who employs another 230. Both companies tell me that President Obama's takeover of health care is causing them to seriously reconsider the ability to expand and hire more employees. In fact, they may not survive.

These are just two companies in eastern Ohio. What about the thousands of small businesses across America?

President Obama's health care law is a government red tape tower that's raising health care costs, limiting access to health care, and it's hurting job creation at a time when we need real economic growth.

VETERAN EXCELLENCE THROUGH EDUCATION ACT

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. This week marks the 10th anniversary of the onset of the Iraq war. As our troops return home, many still face a high unemployment rate. The statistic is higher for women veterans.

One remedy to this abysmal unemployment rate is education. However, for many veterans, the opportunity to pursue the necessary education is difficult because of economic constraints, family responsibilities, or lack of information about available Federal resources. Similarly, many college campuses struggle to provide veterans with these resources.

That is why I introduced my first bill this week, called the Veteran Excellence Through Education Act. This bill creates a competitive grant program aimed at helping college campuses that serve underrepresented populations and provides academic and related support services for all enrolled veterans in these schools. My district has many nearby schools with a growing veteran student population that would benefit from this bill, such as Cal Poly Pomona, Cal State San Bernardino, San Bernardino Valley Community College, and UC Riverside.

Education is a future investment. It is our obligation to assist veterans with job training and economic opportunity in return for their service to our country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Every American family and small business knows that budgets have to be balanced to be sustainable. For years, though, Washington hasn't been balancing its budget. The Senate hasn't even be passing them. House Republicans have had enough of this ''Washington exceptionalism.'' We've introduced a budget for the Federal Government that will balance in just 10 years.

Budgets reveal priorities, and House Republicans have revealed ours. We want to build a stronger, more prosperous future for this generation and the next. We want to protect the promise of Medicare, guarantee accountability for the use of taxpayer dollars, preserve personal freedoms, and pursue commonsense governance. The American people deserve this, and so we've offered a balanced budget that encourages growth and opportunity for all while paving the way for the country to get out of debt.

Will the President follow our lead and submit a budget that balances?

RYAN BUDGET

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 months have passed since our country reelected President Obama and embraced his plans to keep moving our country forward. But right now, Republicans are offering a budget proposal that includes many of the same ideas that voters rejected this fall. The Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantee as we know it and repeal the Affordable Care Act that's already providing benefits to so many families in my home State of Rhode Island and across this country.

Rhode Islanders don't want another Republican budget proposal that jeopardizes our economic recovery, gives away billions of dollars in tax subsidies to Big Oil, and protects tax breaks to companies that ship jobs overseas. They want a budget that reflects our values and priorities as a Nation, a budget that honors the promises we made to our seniors, puts our country back to work, invests in rebuilding our national infrastructure, protects our investments in education, and reduces our deficit by making smart cuts in spending and reforming our Tax Code.

The Republican budget fails to meet any of these standards, and I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing it this week.

PRESIDENT OBAMA GOES TO ISRAEL

(Mr. ROSKAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that over 100 colleagues have joined together on both sides of the aisle to send a letter to President Obama commending his trip to Israel and also asking him to use it as an opportunity to continue to put the imprimatur of the administration on a strong U.S.-Israeli relationship. We also urge the President to continue to make sure that all options are on the table as it relates to Iran and their nuclear ambitions and that we should continue to adopt a policy of prevention and not containment.

Similarly, we said that we need to protect Israel's Qualitative Military Edge and Israel's inherent right to defend itself, and also recognize that the Israeli-Palestinian peace process can only be achieved and advanced through direct negotiations without preconditions.

Finally, we said that the President must maintain foreign aid to Israel, as well as funding for Iron Dome and other Israeli-made antimissile defense systems.

In a nutshell, we've urged the President to use this as a time to highlight our relationship with the Nation of Israel because it makes all the sense in the world, and it's a foundation upon which prosperity can happen.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. MAFFEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I stood here a few days before the sequester deadline and urged this House to take action. The sequester is a set of random, arbitrary, temporary cuts that put thousands of jobs in jeopardy and harm our national security readiness and our economy. Some have yet to see the immediate effects. But this problem is like a pipeline being shut off 10 miles down the road. We may not notice it right away, but soon it'll start to turn into a trickle.

In central New York, we are seeing the effects at our airports, our schools, our hospitals, and throughout our community:

280 employees are slated to be furloughed at the 174th Attack Wing at Hancock Field, a unit currently in operations in Afghanistan;

The air traffic control tower at Hancock Airport may close for overnight flights;

The Syracuse City Schools could lose more than a million dollars in aid. They have already lost nearly a thousand positions in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to slam our schools and expect to have an educated workforce for the 21st century. We need to address our debt and balance the budget. But we can't do it on the backs of our middle class and seniors, and we shouldn't do it at the expense of thousands of hardworking men and women: our teachers, public health workers, law enforcement officers, prison guards, FDA inspectors, Social Security workers, and civilian Defense Department workers. They're just trying to make a living and keep their jobs.

Just as my constituents have asked me to do, I'm going to keep urging this House to take action. We need to work together to protect our middle class, protect jobs, and get our economy moving again. We cannot continue this policy of random cuts time and again, putting our economy at risk. We have to stop punishing our constituents because Washington doesn't work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Members are reminded to heed the gavel at the expiration of the time for which they are recognized.

□ 1220

GET THE FACTS BEFORE BLAMING RENEWABLE FUEL SECTOR

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of media coverage on RINs. A RIN is a renewable identification number which is given to refiners upon the purchase of renewable fuels. It is then used by refiners every February to establish that they have met their previous year's obligation under the Renewable Fuels Standard.

These recent stories raise a question as to why RINs are being blamed in the increase in gasoline prices. RINs are given away for free by ethanol and other renewable fuel producers to the refiners and only have value in the submission of the reports in February. We are currently in the month of March and soon to be in April. There are questions that need to be asked on why such swift dramatic price shifts are being reported in the market? Are speculators at work?

There is an excess of over 2 billion RINs. Why is that not proving and providing stability? I encourage the media to ask these types of questions, but to simply jump on and blame the renewable fuel sector is incorrect.

RECOGNIZING DR. HOPE MICHELSEN AND ALICE DENG FOR INDUCTION INTO WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Dr. Hope Michelsen of Livermore and Alice Deng of Pleasanton for their recent induction into the Alameda County Women's Hall of Fame.

The Hall of Fame recognizes outstanding women in our area and their contributions to our community and Nation. Dr. Michelsen is being honored in the category of science, and she is a leader and trailblazer at Sandia National Laboratory in my district. She is a combustion and atmospheric chemist at Sandia National Lab and a lead researcher on several projects related to energy and climate change.

Alice is being inducted to the Hall of Fame in the youth category. A student at Amador Valley High School in Pleasanton, Alice demonstrates leadership well beyond her years. She is the cofounder of an organization that helps young people overcome their fear of public speaking and an active volunteer with the Tri-Valley Eden Township Youth Community Court.

It's fitting that these extraordinary women are being honored in March, which is Women's History Month. I'm very proud to have both Alice and Dr. Michelsen in my district. Their hard work continues to move our district forward.

CONGRATULATING SOUTHWEST AIRLINES AND DALLAS LOVE FIELD AIRPORT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southwest Airlines and Dallas Love Field Airport as they celebrate the unveiling of the new terminal and long-overdue repeal of the Wright Amendment. This long-awaited milestone goes to show that freedom and free enterprise go hand in hand.

You know, when we first introduced legislation to repeal the Wright Amendment back in 2005, people said it couldn't be done. When government gets out of the way and allows free enterprise to unleash its full potential, businesses expand, create jobs—and in this case soon will offer the people of Dallas and visitors a world-class airport. Passengers pay lower fares and fly nonstop to more destinations across the country. Clearly, when you've got freedom on your side, you're bound to win.

Thank you for your commitment to our community, and congratulations Southwest Airlines and Dallas Love Field.

God bless you, and God bless America.

RYAN BUDGET

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yesterday, I discussed the American Society of Civil Engineers' scorecard. Our infrastructure is failing—it got a D-plus—costing us lost productivity and wasted fuel. Now, we need to deal with that problem, but there is an even bigger problem looming, which is the already inadequate levels of investment in our infrastructure are about to end.

The Ryan budget takes us from a $40 billion investment in our crumbling roads, bridges, and highways to $100 million—$40 billion, $100 million. Transit: $10 billion to zero. That's right. The Ryan budget cuts our investment—that's already inadequate—in infrastructure from $50 billion a year to $100 million. That's about 1 million jobs lost in addition to the accelerated deterioration of the system.

That can't be a serious proposal. This isn't a serious budget. It's balanced on phony premises. Anybody believe we're going to go to zero spending and abandon Federal investment in our roads, bridges, highways, and transit systems? And if they believe that, that's even crazier than the numbers in this budget.

The Democratic budget continues those investments and makes certain we will invest in the future of America.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET A BLUEPRINT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, currently we are experiencing one of the worst economic recoveries in the history of our Nation. It's a stagnant economy, and this should not be the new normal. Our budget is a blueprint for economic growth and job creation.

I can't stress the differences between our budget and the Senate Democrat budget. Their budget raises taxes by over $1 trillion and never balances. This is totally irresponsible.

We cannot continue to borrow nearly $4 billion every day. Current policies and the Senate Democrats' plan is suffocating our economy and job growth.

Our budget brings us to a balanced budget using tax dollars in a fiscally responsible manner, commonsense regulatory tax reforms, and an energy policy that results in economic growth and job creation.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Good day, Mr. Speaker. Good day, my colleagues—or as my Republican colleagues would say, bonjour.

Today, we're considering the Republican budget, which is a plan modeled after European-style austerity measures. In plain English, it is bad.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office makes clear this budget will slow economic growth and kill over 2.5 million American jobs. It requires further sacrifices from our veterans, our seniors, students, small businesses, and hardworking middle class families. It ends Medicare as we know it. And it has no vision for how we're going to create jobs. It doesn't even include the phrase ''job creation.''

The American people rejected this budget in November 2012. The Congress should reject it today. It's time to say au revoir—good-bye—to this Republican budget and move forward with a plan focused on jobs and creating a better future for this country.

SENATE COMMENTS ON MARINE TRAGEDY

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was stunned to watch the senior Democrat leader of the other body implying that the blame for Monday's tragic deaths of seven marines is the result of the recent automatic cuts to defense spending, also known as sequestration—''the sequester.'' His outrageous comments referring to the dead marines' training with explosives implied that the sequester which the President insisted upon was ''going to cut back this stuff''—their training.

I'm appalled because this senior Democrat should know that the sequester cuts have not even been fully implemented. They could not have played a role in these marines' deaths.

As an American who has proudly worn the uniform of a naval officer, I am furious that a Member of Congress would play politics with such a tragedy. The families of these seven marines deserve an apology. I pray that they will get it.

Semper fi, Marines. Semper fi.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act.

In 2008, with strong bipartisan support, Congressman SIMPSON and I introduced the original bill that was signed into law that year. For the first time in history, a scientific method for adding newborn screenings to State programs was established.

Prior to enactment of this law, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for all the recommended disorders. Today, 44 States and the District of Columbia require screening of at least 29 of the 31 core treatable conditions. Unfortunately, critical gaps and challenges remain.

The reauthorization bill establishes a grant program to assist States in developing followup and tracking programs and renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee for Heritable Disorders.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this vital legislation. No child should die or suffer from preventable disabilities which could have been detected at birth.

□ 1230

HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to voice my strong support for the House Republican fiscal year 2014 budget. And I want to commend my colleague, chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, for his ongoing leadership on this issue.

There is simply no denying it: the Federal Government has a spending problem, a problem that has led to nearly $17 trillion of debt. For too long, Washington has shirked its responsibility in addressing this issue and punted the problem to future generations. As a father, I cannot in good conscience let this generational theft continue.

It is critical that we pass a budget that puts our country back on track through responsible cuts and reforms. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, of which I am a member, has already identified numerous duplicative government programs. Yet rather than eliminating these programs, the government continues to pour more money into them.

Congressman RYAN's budget prioritizes our spending so that we protect important programs in the long-term by trimming the waste in government.

BAN ON KNIVES

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago our Nation experienced unimaginable loss caused by the terrorist attacks on September 11. Let us not forget that the terrorists overtook planes using simple box cutters, which were allowed on board at the time.

TSA's recent decision to now lift the ban on knives on aircraft is shockingly irresponsible and reckless. Why make this potentially deadly decision when this policy has been keeping our Nation safer for years? This is dangerous for passengers, flight attendants, and pilots. The airlines, flight attendants, pilots, and Federal air marshals have all expressed their strong opposition to this TSA policy that will compromise their safety and the safety of their passengers.

Americans can plainly see that it is commonsense to keep potential weapons off our airplanes. We have already witnessed the harm knives can cause. Knives took down four planes. Knives took down the World Trade Center. Knives struck at the heart of our Nation's defense. Knives took thousands of innocent lives.

This is a huge step backwards in protecting American security. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with the American people and urge TSA to not implement this reckless strategy.

RYAN BUDGET

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House budget proposal for the 2014 fiscal year. This proposal sets real practical goals that will stop spending money we don't have by cutting wasteful spending, fix our broken Tax Code to create jobs and increase wages, protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, reform welfare programs like Medicaid so that we can deliver on the promises that we have made for those who truly need it, and repeal the President's health care bill so that we can finally replace it with meaningful patient-centered health care.

Most importantly, it reduces the deficit and the debt that we have, and it becomes balanced in 10 years. I am continuously amazed by those on the other side of the aisle who say that this is just crazy talk that we would balance the Federal budget in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, this addresses the issues and the goals that will create a pro-growth economy and which will affect every American family across this country.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR HUGH L. CAREY OF NEW YORK

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished New Yorker and former Member of this body, who will be honored in a special ceremony in New York's 20th Congressional District on April 8. Hugh L. Carey was born in Brooklyn in 1919, enlisted in the Army in World War II, served in Europe where he helped liberate prisoners at a concentration camp, and eventually reached the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Upon returning home, Mr. Carey received a law degree from St. John's University. In 1960, he was elected to this Chamber and went on to serve seven terms before being elected Governor of New York in 1974, a position he held until 1981.

Governor Carey is widely remembered for his steady hand during New York City's economic crisis, during which he brought many competing interests together to forge compromise on difficult issues. He also instituted improvements for the mental health community of New York State. A born storyteller with a quick wit and boundless charm, Hugh Carey was a New Yorker to the core.

I am honored to have this opportunity to remember a former Member of this body, as well as New York's 51st Governor, who throughout his career led with distinction and compassion. I look forward to next month's ceremony recognizing his service in World War II.

PATH TO PROSPERITY

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Path to Prosperity budget on the floor this week reaffirms once again that House Republicans are the only ones in Washington providing genuine, serious solutions to our country's spending-driven debt crisis.

We have released a budget that cuts government spending responsibly, enacts commonsense reforms, and, most importantly, balances the government's books within 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, what have we heard from the President? Well, nothing. The President hasn't even submitted his budget to Congress yet, and it is on track to be one of the latest budget submissions in history. And the Democratic-controlled Senate's budget, of course, raises taxes and never, ever breaks even.

That is not what America needs, Mr. Speaker. With our budget, House Republicans have provided a genuine blueprint for creating more jobs and opportunity in America today.

RESTORE THE TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 1265, bipartisan legislation which would restore tuition assistance for men and women serving in the military.

Earlier this month, the Department of Defense announced that the Army, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard would all be suspending their tuition assistance programs due to sequestration.

I represent Fort Bliss and the 36,000 men and women in uniform who currently serve there. Many of them served in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the tuition assistance programs are critical to help them transition into civilian life and to find good-paying jobs.

This program represents 0.1 percent of the Pentagon's budget. As Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Martin Dempsey has said, ''There's nothing more important in a democracy than education.''

Let's stand up to ensure that those who have given so much for our Nation have access to education. Please join me in supporting H.R. 1265.

DEMOCRATIC BUDGETS

(Mr. MULVANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we are going to start taking up debate on several budgets. I want to point out one important consistent thing about the budgets that my esteemed colleagues will be offering. Not a single one of them ever balances. I will say that again, Mr. Speaker: not a single Democrat budget that is being offered will ever balance.

If we do not have surpluses, we cannot pay down the debt. We will never be able to pay down the debt until we have surpluses. If you offer a budget that never offers any surpluses, there is never any way to repay the debt.

And I respectfully suggest that if I come to you and ask you to lend me money and I have the intention of giving it back to you, that that is truly debt. But if I come to you and ask you to give me money and I have no intention of ever giving it back to you, that is theft. That is exactly what the opponents' budgets will offer us today. There is no way to ever repay any of this debt. It is wrong, and the American public deserve better.

WORLD WATER DAY

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. As a third-generation family farmer, I know firsthand that water is the lifeblood of not only San Joaquin Valley, but our entire world. For decades, generations have had to fight tooth and nail for a reliable water supply. It grows our crops, drives our economic activity, and, more importantly, sustains human life. As the global population continues to grow, the demand on the world's water supply will continue to increase and create greater opportunities for conflict.

Friday is World Water Day when we focus on how we can meet the water needs of all people, regardless of where they live on this planet.

In our valley, we have learned much about ways to conserve water, convey it over long distances, and put it to use efficiently. Nonetheless, in California this year, we will have to deal with another partially caused regulatory drought that was unnecessary.

Water has and will continue to present both challenges and opportunities. We must choose the side of cooperation and collaboration if we are about to solve our world's long-term water needs.

□ 1240

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a proud member of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus to recognize Greek Independence Day.

Let us honor this date in memory of the beloved Andy Athens.

This holiday celebrates the 1821 victory in the Greek people's struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

My grandfather, Arthur Costandinos Cathones, for whom I am named, instilled in me a great love for Greece and Greek culture. The Hellenic values he taught me have served me well as guiding principles throughout my career in public service.

I have enjoyed visiting Greece a number of times to learn firsthand about the birthplace of democracy. These trips have given me a deep understanding of the country's history, its food, its culture, its music and especially its people. I encourage my colleagues to visit Greece to experience all it has to offer.

The U.S. and Greece have always shared a special bond that we should recognize and strengthen instead of repeatedly using Greece as the whipping boy for Europe's economic woes as some have done in speeches on this floor.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ELLMERS). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois
Mr. WOMACK, Arkansas
Mr. ISRAEL, New York
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
Mr. SCHNEIDER, Illinois
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1243

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 19, 2013, time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,270,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,606,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,903,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,028,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,149,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,284,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,457,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,650,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,832,145,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $0.
Fiscal year 2015: $0.
Fiscal year 2016: $0.
Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,769,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,681,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,857,258,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $2,988,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,104,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,281,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,414,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,540,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,681,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,768,151,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,815,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,736,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,850,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,958,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,079,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,231,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,374,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,495,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,667,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,722,071,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: -$544,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$130,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$71,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$54,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$50,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$82,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$89,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$38,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$16,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $110,073,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $17,776,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,086,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,343,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,635,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,938,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,267,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,608,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,900,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,162,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,319,503,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $12,849,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,069,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,225,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,362,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,485,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,648,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,836,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,992,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,154,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,210,984,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $579,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $41,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $47,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,030,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $28,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $32,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $33,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,344,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$147,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $38,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $36,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $38,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $39,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $39,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $40,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $39,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,382,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,859,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,000,000,000..
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,398,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$21,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,654,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $81,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $91,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $68,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $92,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $72,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $99,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,906,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $8,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $8,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $8,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $8,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $8,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $8,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $9,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $9,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $9,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,271,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $73,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $85,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $95,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $100,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $99,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,780,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $363,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $358,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $359,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $375,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $387,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $393,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $422,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $420,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $441,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $456,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,134,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $515,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $534,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $597,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $621,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $679,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $723,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $770,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $771,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $845,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $843,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $875,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $874,988,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $509,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $508,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $480,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $487,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $484,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $479,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $484,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $495,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $501,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $496,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $505,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $515,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $510,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,354,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $56,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,195,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,116,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $341,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $367,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $405,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $476,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $555,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $613,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $661,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $694,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $694,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $723,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $745,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $745,963,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$59,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$44,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$58,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$53,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$65,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$59,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$71,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$65,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$81,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$89,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$89,323,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings (930):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$17,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$11,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$13,555,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$99,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$99,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$109,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$109,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$115,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$115,049,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $93,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,694,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than __________, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(4) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(5) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit

changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(6) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(7) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050

SEC. 301. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2040, and 2050 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 0 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 0 percent.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 406. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under P.L. 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2014, the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, or the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending programs.

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget converts the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, indexed for inflation and population growth. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that has tied the hands of State governments. Instead, each State would have the freedom and flexibility to tailor a Medicaid program that fits the needs of its unique population. Moreover, this budget repeals the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of its crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget converts the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, increases in the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most. Additionally, it requires that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Those in or near retirement will see no changes, while future retirees would be given a choice of private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

TITLE VI—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 601. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Veterans Health Care Budget and Reform Transparency Act of 2009 provides advance appropriations for the following veteran medical care accounts: Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities.

(2) The President has yet to submit a budget request as required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, including the request for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for fiscal year 2014, hence the request for veteran medical care advance appropriations for fiscal year 2015 is unavailable as of the writing of this concurrent resolution.

(3) This concurrent resolution reflects the most up-to-date estimate on veterans' health care needs included in the President's fiscal year 2013 request for fiscal year 2015.

(b) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (c), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (d)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations''.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $55,483,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

(C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 602. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly.

SEC. 603. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPLEMENT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND TO FUND VETERANS' PROGRAMS AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—(A) The President has not submitted a budget for fiscal year 2014 as required pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, by the date set forth in that section.

(B) In missing the statutory date by which the budget must be submitted, this will be the fourth time in five years the President has not complied with that deadline.

(C) This concurrent resolution reflects the levels of funding for veterans' medical programs as set forth in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(2) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

(3) REVISED CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE BASELINE.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical and economic assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through fiscal year 2023 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 604. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of $5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 605. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 606. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—(1) The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 604.

(2) Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation of new budget authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for that fiscal year to be exceeded or the sum of the limits on the security and non-security category in section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act as reduced pursuant to such section.

SEC. 607. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan guarantees are treated unequally in the

budget. The Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal housing programs on the basis of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (''FCRA'').

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, cash-basis accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate risks such as prepayment and default risk.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $635 billion of loans and loan guarantees issued in 2013 alone would generate budgetary savings of $45 billion over their lifetime using FCRA accounting. However, these same loans and loan guarantees would have a lifetime cost of $11 billion under fair-value methodology.

(4) The majority of loans and guarantees issued in 2013 would show deficit reduction of $9.1 billion under FCRA methodology, but would increase the deficit by $4.7 billion using fair-value accounting.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(c) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a cost related to a housing or residential mortgage program under the FCRA, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such cost.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

SEC. 608. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 609. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2014. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2014, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 610. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 701. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the U.S. economy technically emerged from recession roughly four years ago, the recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound with the unemployment rate still elevated and real economic growth essentially flat in the final quarter of 2012.

(2) The enormous build-up of Government debt in the past four years has worsened the already unsustainable course of Federal finances and is an increasing drag on the U.S. economy.

(3) During the recession and early stages of recovery, the Government took a variety of measures to try to boost economic activity. Despite the fact that these stimulus measures added over $1 trillion to the debt, the economy continues to perform at a sub-par trend.

(4) Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation – and they act accordingly. It is this debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, that is weighing on U.S. growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Economists have found that the key to jump-starting U.S. economic growth and job creation is tangible action to rein in the growth of Government spending with the aim of getting debt under control.

(6) Stanford economist John Taylor has concluded that reducing Government spending now would ''reduce the threats of higher taxes, higher interest rates and a fiscal crisis'', and would therefore provide an immediate stimulus to the economy.

(7) Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has stated that putting in place a credible plan to reduce future deficits ''would not only enhance economic performance in the long run, but could also yield near-term benefits by leading to lower long-term interest rates and increased consumer and business confidence.''

(8) Lowering spending would boost market confidence and lessen uncertainty, leading to a spark in economic expansion, job creation, and higher wages and income.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of growing the economy and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 702. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The U.S. tax code fails on all three counts – it is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Since 2001 alone, there have been more than 3,250 changes to the code. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than $1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and very complex.

(3) These tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals. For instance, the top 1 percent of taxpayers reap about 3 times as much benefit from special tax credits and deductions (excluding refundable credits) than the middle class and 13 times as much benefit than the lowest income quintile.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base by as much as 50 percent. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) The National Taxpayer Advocate reports that taxpayers spent 6.1 billion hours in 2012 complying with tax requirements.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of U.S. active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a ''pass-through'' basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses in particular tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income reaches 44.6 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. The total Federal marginal tax rate on corporate income now reaches 55 percent, when including the shareholder-level tax on dividends and capital

gains. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the U.S. corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The U.S. tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The ''worldwide'' structure of U.S. international taxation essentially taxes earnings of U.S. firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the U.S. tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of U.S. companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged 18 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 19.1 percent of the economy, and – if the spending restraints in this budget are enacted – this level is sufficient to fund Government operations over time.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy.

(15) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(16) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board – not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on the American people.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation during fiscal year 2014 that provides for a comprehensive reform of the U.S. tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through revenue-neutral fundamental tax reform, which should be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House not later than December 31, 2013, that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reduces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals, with a goal of achieving a top individual rate of 25 percent and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into two brackets with a first bracket of 10 percent;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate to 25 percent; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

SEC. 703. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2023 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.2 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to exceed 7 percent of GDP by 2040 and reach 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) The President's health care law created a new Federal agency called the Independent Payment Advisory Board (''IPAB'') empowered with unilateral authority to cut Medicare spending. As a result of that law—

(A) IPAB will be tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal Gross Domestic Product (GDP) plus one percentage point;

(B) the fifteen unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats of IPAB will make decisions that will reduce seniors access to care;

(C) the nonpartisan Office of the Medicare Chief Actuary estimates that the provider cuts already contained in the Affordable Care Act will force 15 percent of hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and home health agencies to close in 2019; and

(D) additional cuts from the IPAB board will force even more health care providers to close their doors, and the Board should be repealed.

(4) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

SEC. 704. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the ''three-legged stool'' of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.319 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by over 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 25 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees shall, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th-year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President shall promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and

the Majority Leader of the House shall introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred shall report the bill which shall be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President shall—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

SEC. 705. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) More than 21 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the last decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2001-2002 Academic Year and the 2011-2012 Academic Year:

(A) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 5.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(B) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.8 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(C) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at private four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(4) Over that same period, Federal financial aid has increased 140 percent beyond the rate of general inflation.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted that, ''We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money.''

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt nearly tripled between 2004 and 2012, and now stands at nearly $1 trillion. Student debt now has the second largest balance after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2015 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America's young people.

(b) POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at $5,645 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

SEC. 706. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the last available estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 707. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The House of Representatives cut budgets for Members of Congress, House committees, and leadership offices by 5 percent in 2011 and an additional 6.4 percent in 2012.

(2) The House of Representatives achieved savings of $36.5 million over three years by consolidating House operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

SEC. 708. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs ''could potentially save tens of billions of dollars.''

(3) In 2011 and 2012, the Government Accountability Office issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) 209 ''Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics'' (''STEM'') education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of $3 billion annually;

(B) 200 separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of $3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) 20 different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of $170 billion in 2010;

(D) 17 separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent $37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) 13 programs, 3 tax benefits, and one loan program to reduce diesel emissions; and

(F) 94 different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage ''green building'' in the private sector.

(4) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government's information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent – or $20 billion – of the Government's annual information technology budget.

(5) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(6) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(7) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2014, 42 laws will expire, possibly resulting in $685 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(8) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 709. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively. Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

The CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–21.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SEC. 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 and 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $2,038,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,290,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,646,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,833,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,973,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,111,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,245,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,400,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,592,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,800,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,991,775,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $0,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $40,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $70,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $82,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $95,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $115,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $135,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $149,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $159,630,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $3,054,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,963,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,046,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,211,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,386,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,568,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,779,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,973,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,136,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,350,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,492,138,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $2,956,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,997,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,082,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,240,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,382,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,542,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,749,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,926,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,103,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,323,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,451,446,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $917,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $706,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $435,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $406,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $409,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $431,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $504,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $526,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $511,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $522,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $459,672,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,113,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,008,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,626,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,222,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,871,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,558,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,312,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,094,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,863,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,634,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,364,925,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $12,274,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,059,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,588,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,081,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,574,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,081,187,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: $15,669,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,297,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,929,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,600,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,229,414,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $669,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $731,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $766,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $812,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $861,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $908,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $951,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $994,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,038,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,083,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,129,163,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $634,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $711,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $756,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $805,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $856,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $907,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $962,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,022,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,086,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,154,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,227,009,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,751,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $648,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $658,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $567,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $575,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $582,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $590,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $574,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $607,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $616,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $625,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $636,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,603,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $58,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $51,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $55,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,212,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,643,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $4,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,913,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $42,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $42,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $44,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $49,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $52,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,703,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,959,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−30,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−24,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−4,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $17,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,032,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $100,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $88,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $88,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $89,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $90,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $91,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $91,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $93,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $94,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $95,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $96,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,364,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $51,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $28,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $29,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,953,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $78,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $89,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $106,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $117,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $123,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $119,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $120,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $122,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $124,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $126,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,845,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $365,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $420,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $500,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $493,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $554,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $611,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $648,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $648,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $685,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $684,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $732,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $764,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $808,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $852,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $851,028,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $511,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $535,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $540,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $586,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $602,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $626,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $687,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $686,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $734,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $782,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $782,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $855,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $855,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $883,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $883,062,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $544,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $537,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $536,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $538,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $565,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $578,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $592,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $611,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $612,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $619,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,921,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $150,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $161,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $176,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $180,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $188,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $187,433,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $63,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $65,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $67,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $76,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,564,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,304,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $331,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $342,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $370,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $419,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $608,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $683,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $683,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $752,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $752,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $806,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $859,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $859,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $905,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $905,971,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−35,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−42,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−20,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−51,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−36,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−61,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−48,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−68,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−61,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−76,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−70,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−84,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−80,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−92,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−89,556,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−90,137,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−90,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $−90,503,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−90,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $−97,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−97,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $−98,916,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−98,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $−103,177,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−103,177,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $−105,117,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−105,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $−108,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to increase the total level of revenues by $975,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPLACE SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240) to repeal or revise the enforcement procedures established under those sections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. For purposes of determining deficit-neutrality under this section, the Chairman may include the estimated effects of any amendment or amendments to the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)).

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.

(a) EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employment and job growth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to the unemployed, or improve the unemployment compensation program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to trade, including Trade Adjustment Assistance programs or international agreements for economic assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO ASSIST WORKING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN.

(a) INCOME SUPPORT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, child support enforcement programs, or other assistance to working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to housing assistance, which may include working family rental assistance, or assistance provided through the Housing Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) CHILD WELFARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child welfare programs, which may include the Federal foster care payment system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) HOME VISITING.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief or refundable tax relief, relief that supports innovation by United States enterprises, or relief that expands the ability of startup companies to benefit from the credit for research and experimentation expenses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a sustainable revenue base that leads to a fairer, more progressive, and more efficient tax system than currently exists, and to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

(1) the reduction of our Nation's dependence on imported energy and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production;

(2) energy conservation and renewable energy development, or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing;

(3) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program;

(4) Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition;

(5) greenhouse gas emissions levels;

(6) the preservation, restoration, or protection of the Nation's public lands, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems;

(7) agreements between the United States and jurisdictions of the former Trust Territory;

(8) wildland fire management activities; or

(9) the restructure of the nuclear waste program;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States, which may include projects for transportation, housing, energy, water, telecommunications, or financing through tax credit bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

(1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (concurrent receipt);

(2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;

(3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans; or

(4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space and maintenance of Department facilities;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make higher education more accessible and affordable, which may include legislation to increase college enrollment and completion rates for low-income students, or promote college savings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR HEALTH CARE.

(a) PHYSICIAN REIMBURSEMENT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that increase payments made under, or permanently reform or replace, the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE POLICIES.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that extend expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote improvements to health care delivery systems, which may include changes that increase care quality, encourage efficiency, or improve care coordination, and that improve the fiscal sustainability of health care spending over the long term, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) THERAPY CAPS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that protect access to outpatient therapy services (including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech-language pathology services) through measures such as repealing or increasing the current outpatient therapy caps, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(e) DRUG SAFETY.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to drug safety, which may include legislation that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN OUR NATION'S COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) or make changes to chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976''), or both, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651) or prior Acts, authorize similar or related programs, provide for revenue changes, or any combination of the purposes under this section, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to water infrastructure programs or make changes to the collection and expenditure of the Harbor Maintenance Tax (subchapter A of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PENSION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the pension system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HOUSING FINANCE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote appropriate access to mortgage credit for individuals and families or examine the role of government in the secondary mortgage market, which may include legislation to restructure government-sponsored enterprises, or provide for mortgage refinance opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support Department of Defense auditability and acquisition reform efforts, which may include legislation that limits the use of incremental funding, or that promotes affordability or appropriate contract choice, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (Public Law 107–297; 116 Stat. 2322), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the United States Postal Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, or the sale of Federal property, or reduce improper payments, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this resolution, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2013—

(A) for the security category, $684,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the nonsecurity category, $359,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(2) for fiscal year 2014—

(A) for the revised security category, $497,352,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, $469,023,000,000 in budget authority;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2) or (3) is placed on the calendar, or upon the offering of an amendment or motion thereto, or the laying down of an amendment between the Houses or a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for emergency requirements (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(B) DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for continuing disability reviews and redeterminations (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for health care fraud and abuse control (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(D) DISASTER RELIEF.—Measures making appropriations for disaster relief (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas contingency operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), up to the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2013, $99,670,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom); and

(ii) for fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''nonsecurity category'' means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category;

(2) the term ''revised nonsecurity category'' means all discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050;

(3) the term ''revised security category'' means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050; and

(4) the term ''security category'' means discretionary appropriations associated with agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the

intelligence community management account (95–0401–0–1–054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

SEC. 402. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2014 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 402 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION OR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER CURRENT LAW.—If the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such enforcement.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS IF AMENDED.—If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the adjustments to discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of that Act, or the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of that Act or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 411. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse, or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 412. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 413. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 414. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 415. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law

(3) No significant reforms to means-tested direct spending are proposed.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent.

(3) No significant reforms to nonmeans-tested direct spending are proposed.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last year at this time I came before this body and I offered as an amendment, as a possible replacement, the budget offered by the President of the United States. It failed overwhelmingly. In fact, I think it failed to receive a single vote.

I did that in order to promote a debate, and I think we had that debate. I think that was healthy.

Remember, a budget is more than just a spending document. It is also a vision document. I had hoped to be able to do the exact same thing this year, to bring forth the President's budget to discuss not only the spending levels in that budget, but also the vision contained in that particular budget. Imagine my surprise then when this week came around and we waited for the President's budget and it was not offered.

It was not offered for the first time in modern history. This is the first time in modern history that a President has failed to offer a budget before the United States House of Representatives took up the topic. It's the very first time since the Budget Act of 1921. I don't know how we're supposed to discuss the President's vision for the Nation as contained in the budget when it's not here. I think that's wrong.

It's required by law, Mr. Chairman. The law requires the President to submit a budget before today. I believe this is now the third or fourth time he's been late during his Presidency. It's inexcusable. It's inexcusable, regardless of the party of the President, not to follow the law and not to offer a budget.

So it's with great regret, Mr. Chairman, I'm not able to offer to you today for discussion before this body the vision for this Nation contained in the President's budget because no such documents exist. I actually tried, by the way. I offered a 34-page document full of question marks, but appropriately that was ruled out of order as not being able to be brought forward to the House. Again, it is with great reluctance I'm not able to offer the President's budget.

Why am I here? I'm here instead to offer as a substitute the budget that passed the Senate Budget Committee last week. It's the first budget to be taken up by the Senate, I believe, in 4 years. I would like to think it's a direct result of the bipartisan action that this body took several weeks ago in passing No Budget, No Pay. The Senate assures us, Mr. Chairman, they were going to do a budget anyway. I took them at their word. And I'm glad that this body was able to pass out No Budget, No Pay in order to give them the additional incentive to do that.

What have they done? What has the Senate offered us? What did the Senate pass out of committee last week on entirely partisan lines? They offered us a budget that increases taxes by $900 billion over the tax window. In fact, that's the smallest amount. That's the amount they admit to. If you take the Senate committee at their word, they also want to undo the sequester and add an additional $100 billion worth of stimulus money, and they want to do that without impacting the deficit. You can safely assume, I believe, that it's $1.5 trillion, not $900 billion, but $1.5 trillion in new taxes out of our colleagues in the Senate on the Democratic committee.

They increased spending by $265 billion over the baseline over the next decade, and they also spend $4.9 trillion more than does the Republican budget that we'll offer later today. Their spending, as offered in their budget, grows by 4.7 percent annually, one of the highest rates of growth other than the last several years in the history of the Nation.

The deficit, according to their budget, in the year 2023, will be $566 billion. In contrast, the budget that we will be offering will be surplus in 2023. It will finally allow us to start paying down the debt; and there are no significant reforms at all in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

How you can have a vision for this country going forward and not at least discuss possible and reasonable reforms to those programs is beyond me, but somehow it passed out of the Senate committee.

□ 1250

Defense is cut by an additional quarter of a trillion dollars over the sequester cuts that we've already had and over the reductions that the Defense Department voluntarily took upon itself during the last budget process.

Now, I've come before this body before, Mr. Chairman, and encouraged this body, in a bipartisan fashion, to look to the Defense Department as possible ways to save money, under the belief that there must be some money in the Defense Department that can be saved in a responsible fashion. What the Senate has done goes so far beyond that that it's hard to fathom—an additional quarter of a trillion dollars in defense spending reductions over the next 10 years.

Finally, perhaps most tellingly and most importantly, the Senate budget never balances—ever. It never balances. What does that say? They have no plan for ever repaying the debt. You cannot repay the debt until we start moving to surplus, and any budget that never goes to surplus never pays down the debt. I've said it before and I'll say it again: if you borrow money from people and are never intending to pay it back, you're not borrowing it from them—you're stealing it from them. That's exactly what this budget contemplates: borrowing money and borrowing money with no intention—a stated position of no intention—to ever be able to pay the money back.

I'm glad they did it. I'm glad to think that they did it of their own accord without ''no budget-no pay'' hanging over their heads, and I applaud them for at least taking the first step in the last 4 years to put forth their vision of spending and of what the future of this country should hold. At the same time, I think it's incumbent upon us to have this debate and then to send a very strong message to the Senate that their ideas are not the right ideas for this country. I hope we get a chance to debate this further.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I actually had been prepared to come to the floor of this House and say this was a refreshing moment, that this was going to be a moment of bipartisanship. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) for finally offering a balanced plan to reduce our long-term deficit and a plan that will make sure our economy grows rather than offering a plan that results in over 750,000 fewer American jobs by the end of this year, and I hope that the gentleman will demonstrate his sincerity in the support of his own bill by voting for it. We will be able to tell whether this is simply some kind of stunt or a genuine effort.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, with respect to the comments about the President's budget, I think everyone in this country knows that this Congress was here until January 2 of this year, trying to work out a compromise to avoid going over the fiscal cliff, and until we'd resolved that, the President had no idea how much revenue would be available for the budget. I think most families recognize that you need to know how much revenue is available as you put together a budget, number one.

Number two, we've been lurching from one manufactured crisis to another. The sequester. You need to know how the sequester is going to turn out before you know how much money is going to be available for government agencies.

Finally, when the President has to put together a budget, it's not like the budgets Members of Congress put together in which you have one amount for all of defense or just one amount for the function for all of health care and all of education. The President actually has to allocate that money among different agencies. That's part of the process. So the President will be submitting a budget now that we know what the revenue stream is, now that we have some idea as to where we are in terms of those other issues.

I'm glad the gentleman brought forward this alternative, because it is the Senate Democratic proposal for the most part. Just for the record, he has left some stuff out, but it's close enough for negotiation and discussion purposes here.

What this measure does is, number one, replaces the sequester. It replaces the sequester with a balanced approach to reducing our long-term deficit so that you avoid the job losses that will result from the sequester. Our referees, our umpires—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—has told us, if we allow that sequester to remain in place, you will have 750,000 fewer Americans working at the end of this year. We also know that you'll have 2 million fewer jobs next year.

So it's a good thing that the gentleman brought to the floor a proposal to replace the sequester. After all, in comments last year, the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR, called for a plan to replace the sequester, so we support that.

The gentleman talks about the Senate proposal on taxes. What he doesn't tell you is what the Senate proposal does. Like the House Democratic proposal, it proposes to balance the budget through a combination of cuts but also cuts to tax expenditures. These are the special preferences and deductions in the Tax Code. We say, yes, we should eliminate some of those tax preferences for very high-income individuals. Our colleagues tell us there are about $4 trillion worth of those that mostly go to high-income individuals. We say, okay, let's close some of those tax breaks of about $1 trillion over 10 years to help reduce the deficit. What's different between the Republican plan and this plan that our colleague has brought up is that they propose to provide tax cuts for very wealthy people, financed by increasing the tax burden on middle-income people.

We put that question to the test in the Budget Committee just the other day. We said, if your plan doesn't propose to give folks at the top a big tax break—because you do in your budget drop it from 39 percent to 25 percent. So a millionaire sees more than a third cut in his rate right off the bat. So we said, well, if it's not your intention to finance that by increasing middle class taxes, you should support this amendment. It was called the Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increases, and it was very simple. It said, as part of tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income people to finance your tax breaks for folks at the very top. Every Republican voted ''no.''

So, yes, this plan that the gentleman has brought forward today, apparently under sort of a mock bipartisanship, will reduce the deficit in a balanced way. It calls for shared responsibility, and it certainly does not give folks at the very top a tax break financed by middle-income taxpayers like the Republican proposal does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, you live in a neighborhood. You look down the street, and there's a neighbor there. They've got new cars, and they're remodeling the kitchen, and they take a lot of expensive vacations. You look down the street, and you wonder: How are they doing that? They live on the same street that we live on. How are they doing all that stuff? And you're tempted. You sit there and think, well, why don't we get some new cars, and why don't we redo the kitchen and take some longer, nicer, more expensive trips. Then, one day, the sticker goes up on the window of that house that says that they have to leave. The moving van comes up, and the house is foreclosed upon—the cars go away; they can't use the kitchen anymore; they're not taking any more trips. Then you realize you made the right decision.

It was a mirage. It looked like they could pay for all that, but they couldn't. This is an allegory for what's going on now.

The United States has neighbors in the world—Greece, Spain, Cyprus, Japan—and they have those stickers going up, those foreclosure things going up, because they can't pay for what they're doing. The Senate budget that's before us follows that same path—a mirage of having a lot of what seems to be great things, but you can't pay for them, and eventually that eviction and that foreclosure will come.

We cannot do that. We cannot foreclose on Medicare. We cannot foreclose on the things that we provide for people. We cannot foreclose on the job engine that is this country. And we don't foreclose on it by having a balanced approach, which means balancing the budget, which means bringing the budget into balance, into line, so that those stickers don't go up on this house we call the United States of America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the only comparison between these budgets we're debating and what's going on in Europe is that the Republican budget proposes the same European-style austerity approach that many European countries tried, and as a result, they've seen their economies slip back into recession. We want to avoid slowing down economic growth in this country, which is why we're really glad that the gentleman from South Carolina brought this particular budget proposal to the floor of the House, and we hope he will vote for it.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

□ 1300

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans agree that deficit reduction is important; and, in fact, over the past year and a half, we've achieved over $2.7 trillion in debt reduction. But now, the Republicans want to take us through a charade with this Tea Party budget.

If enacted, the Republican budget would weaken America's recovery. It would undermine what makes America great and what makes America strong, like education, the ability of students to attend college, medical research and innovation, the ability of our older neighbors to live their lives in dignity in their retirement years through Medicare and long-term care.

Now, we get a lot of advice, and economists across the board, in fact our own Congressional Budget Office, advise that the best and fastest way to reduce the deficit is to make sure that people across America have jobs and are working. So it is inexplicable that the Republican budget proposes to eliminate jobs in construction, in education, scientific research, and instead heap the burden on middle class families.

Experts predict that the Republican budget will result in job losses of 2 million fewer jobs next year alone, and that's on top of 750,000 jobs lost by the end of the year due to the sequester Republicans will not replace, just as the economy is improving for our neighbors and small businesses back home.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative will generate 1.2 million more jobs and stop the sequester. And in committee, Democrats proposed to close those special interest tax loopholes that riddle our Tax Code, and Republicans said, no. Democrats proposed to offset unwise Republican cuts to medical research like Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes research at NIH; Republicans said, no. Democrats tried to cut the special interest spending in the Tax Code to offset Republican cuts to students who rely on Pell Grants; but Republicans said, no.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentlelady.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Democrats in the Budget Committee proposed to strengthen Medicare and replace the Republican plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program. All it does is simply shift the cost to our families and older neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget is not consistent with American values. It is not fiscally responsible. It is a charade. It is a capitulation to the Tea Party. It does not serve us well in economic recovery and the ways we want to grow America. It's a plan for economic weakness. It's a receding vision of American greatness in education, scientific research and infrastructure, and dignity for our parents and grandparents in their retirement years.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget and support the balanced Democratic alternative.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Our fiscal problem can be summed up in just three numbers: 39, 37, and 64. Thirty-nine percent is the combined increase of inflation and population over the past 10 years. Thirty-seven percent is the increase in revenues. The third number is what's killing us: 64 percent is the increase in spending. It's nearly twice the rate of inflation and population growth.

This has never been a revenue problem; it has always been a spending problem. Yet characteristic of other Democratic budgets, the Senate further accelerates spending while trying to chase it with $1 trillion of new taxes. And despite $1 trillion of new taxes, they can't ever balance their budget. And there's a reason: because it's a spending problem, and dogmatically trying to address it on the revenue side will simply drive more and more spending until we become Greece or Detroit.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the last time I was at this table and was accused of doing something for a political stunt or a gimmick was for No Budget, No Pay. So I'll take those criticisms because I think we were able to move in the right direction with that particular bill.

I would simply ask my friend if he's more bothered by this political stunt or by the stunt being perpetrated by the President of the United States for not offering a budget. We had time to do one. He had time to do one. The President clearly had time to do one and is intentionally not delivering it to us, and I think that does a disservice to the entire process.

Finally, all of that said, I want to thank my friend from Maryland for reminding us once again that only in Washington, D.C., can a cut never cut, can a freeze never freeze, and a balanced approach to a budget never balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I will just ask our colleagues to take a look at the latest analysis put forward by our own Congressional Budget Office, the professionals, the referees here. What they tell us is that half of the deficit in this year is as a result of the fact that millions of Americans are still looking for work. Three-quarters of the projected deficit next year is for the very reason, which is why we get to the heart of the issue, by going after the jobs deficit and then reducing the deficit in a balanced manner over a long period of time.

The issue isn't whether we reduce our deficits dramatically; it is how we do it. We call for a balanced approach that, yes, asks the very wealthy people to get rid of some of their special interest tax breaks which our Republican colleagues concede they have, but get rid of them in part to reduce the deficit. Our colleagues refuse to take one penny from closing tax loopholes—not one—to help reduce the deficit. They'll only do that to help finance tax breaks for higher-income individuals.

So, Mr. Chairman, we focus right now on jobs, growing the economy, and a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the Congressional Black Caucus to offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,485,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,835,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,025,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,170,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,307,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,441,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,588,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,774,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,980,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,175,445,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $214,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $228,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $246,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $267,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $278,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $292,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $304,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $317,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $330,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $343,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $3,325,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,188,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,291,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,442,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,623,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,820,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,017,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,190,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,421,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,575,518,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $3,155,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,235,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,354,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,457,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,608,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,787,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,966,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,152,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,389,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,531,318,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: −$669,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$399,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$329,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$286,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$301,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$345,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$378,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$377,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$408,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$355,873,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $17,946,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,528,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,045,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,571,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,128,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,355,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $21,990,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,647,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,273,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $13,019,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,511,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,298,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,674,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,583,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,082,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,638,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,164,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,415,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $51,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $53,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $56,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,685,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,132,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,586,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $48,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $46,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $50,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $52,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $53,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,469,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,210,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,318,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $226,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $158,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $114,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $99,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $98,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $99,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $99,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,033,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $42,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $18,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $15,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,895,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $197,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $148,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $121,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $124,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $120,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $121,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $123,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $125,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $128,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,798,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $429,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $502,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $557,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $614,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $651,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $688,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $687,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $768,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $766,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $811,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $809,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $860,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,599,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $526,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $685,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $862,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $894,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,227,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $538,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $532,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $542,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $541,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $544,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $549,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $562,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $576,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $595,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $603,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,661,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,438,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $149,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $154,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $166,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $165,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $164,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $175,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $180,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $184,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $196,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $192,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,499,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $78,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $62,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $61,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $60,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $62,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $77,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76.916,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $26,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $30,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,721,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $342,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $369,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $417,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $499,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $594,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $664,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $725,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $725,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $773,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $773,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $820,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $820,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $861,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,941,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $2,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $2,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $2,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2.708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $3,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,927,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

SEC. 4. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimate average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) This concurrent resolution retains the social safety net that has lifted millions of Americans out of poverty and protects both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid from draconian spending cuts.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health-care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

(B) Any savings derived from changes or reforms to Medicare and Social Security should be used to extend the solvency of these vital programs and not be used to offset the cost of cutting taxes.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The underlying Republican budget dismantles the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicaid in the last year by 25 percent and includes unspecified cuts in a category called ''other mandatory spending.'' That category, of course, is Social Security and pensions for veterans and Federal employees. And then it cuts other essential Federal programs. It also repeals ObamaCare, but keeps in place the savings and tax increases that pay for it. The Republican budget also includes a $5.7 trillion tax cut that primarily benefits the wealthiest Americans and then somehow claims it will be revenue neutral by raising somebody else's taxes by $5.7 trillion, an average of about $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in America every year.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget on the other hand is based on reality and uses real numbers. Our budget makes tough choices, but not at the expense of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget calls for revenue enhancements of $2.7 trillion over the next 10 years. The budget shows that this is a real and achievable goal by highlighting approximately $4.2 trillion in revenue options that the Congress could use to achieve the $2.7 trillion in new revenues, such as limiting the deductibility of corporate interest payments, limiting the special tax breaks and corporate loopholes that are baked into our Tax Code, treating capital gains and dividends like regular income. And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this amount is less than half of the $5.7 trillion in tax increases assumed in the Republican budget.

□ 1310

The revenue enhancements called for in our budget will be used to totally cancel the sequester, to pay for a $500 billion jobs bill that will put more than 5 million Americans back to work, and to provide for an additional $300 billion in long-term investments in our economy through education, job training, health care, science, and research.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Even with these additional investments, our budget is projected to put our Nation back on a sustainable path because the deficit reduction is more than the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction commission 10-year goal.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget shows that we can create jobs, invest in education, transportation, and research, and avoid devastating health care cuts and achieve the 10-year Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction goal. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, Mr. SCOTT, for bringing forward a budget on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. I think it's important that we have all sorts of options here on the floor to be able to discuss as they relate to a budget.

I would note a couple of items that he conveniently left out. One is that the budget that the CBC brings to the floor—this will come as no surprise, Mr. Chairman—never gets to balance, which means it continues to spend more money than the government takes in, continues to spend more money than Washington takes in. The people of this great country understand that we can't continue going down this road over and over and over and over.

A couple of points that Mr. SCOTT made regarding the Republican budget, which is the budget that is the base budget here that we're bringing to the floor that, in fact, does get to balance in a responsible way:

It saves and strengthens and secures Medicare, as opposed to the misinformation that was provided by the other side;

It makes certain that States have the kind of flexibility so that they're able to provide the highest quality of health care to their Medicaid population;

It doesn't, as a matter of fact, address in a specific way the issue of Social Security because it provides for a reserve fund so that that is able to be addressed in a more specific way through the committee structure, which is also the important thing to recognize about the issue of taxes.

Our friends on the other side are so specific about what they accuse us of regarding taxes, but, in fact, as you know, Mr. Chairman, it's the Ways and Means Committee that will ultimately define that.

A couple of items that he conveniently left out on the budget that he is proposing is that they do raise taxes. In fact, they raise taxes by $2.8 trillion—$2.8 trillion over the next 10 years—and much of that increase in taxes is in the area of those who create jobs. We all know that if you tax something, you get less of it. So by taxing job creators, we'll get fewer jobs, and, Mr. Chairman, that's the last place we need to be heading right now. They spend $5.7 trillion more than the Republican budget that's being proposed, and they add another $2.9 trillion to the debt relative to the base budget that we're working on today.

I also want to address the issue of business taxes. They talk about removing the incentives that move jobs overseas. Well, Mr. Chairman, the biggest incentive to moving jobs overseas is that the United States now has the highest business tax rate in the industrialized world. If you're a business and you're planning on either expanding your business or you're thinking about starting a business here in the United States and you go to the line that says taxes, the other side of that says, no, go somewhere else, get out of here, because taxes are lower elsewhere, which means that jobs are being created elsewhere. We're driving jobs overseas by virtue of our current tax structure, and our friends on the other side of the aisle, especially with the CBC budget, actually increase that as opposed to decrease that.

I do, however, want to commend them, once again, for bringing a budget forward because, as you've heard earlier today and in the conversations around the budget, the President has not. We did find it. I found the President's budget. Here it is. Not a doggone thing on this poster, Mr. Chairman, because the President hasn't brought anything to us.

Now, that might be amusing to some, but the fact of the matter is that the law states that the President of the United States is required to present a budget to Congress by the first Monday in February. That was February 4 this year. We're a little over 6 weeks beyond that. The President has flagrantly—flagrantly—ignored his statutory responsibility to bring to the United States Congress a budget.

Now, some folks on the other side say, Oh, it happens all the time. Don't worry about that. It happens all the time. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in just one term, President Obama has missed the budget deadline more than any other President. He's now missed it four out of five times.

In the 90 years between 1923 and 2013, President Obama is the only President to miss the deadline 2 years in a row. He's the only President who's missed the deadline 3 out of 4 years in his first term, and he holds the record for the longest delay—98 days. Maybe that's the record he's trying to beat, Mr. Chairman.

So I want to commend, again, my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for bringing forward a budget. As I say, I think it's extremely important that we have all sorts of different ideas out here on the floor to be able to debate and have people take a perspective on and have the opportunity to vote ''yea'' or ''nay'' on. I would respectfully suggest, however, that their budget moves this country in the wrong direction, not the right direction, and we'll urge opposition to their budget proposal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, gentleman from Virginia, for yielding me the time.

It's really my privilege to discuss the jobs program that is at the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. The Congressional Black Caucus does acknowledge that, while me must address our debt and deficits, in the short run, an austerity budget, as the Republicans have proposed, hurts our economy rather than helps.

We have proposed a comprehensive jobs plan, paid for proudly with the largesse and the revenue that the rich have received and tax reform measures that will propel our economic recovery for everyone, not just the haves, improve our economic competitiveness, and provide opportunities for those communities that still have not reaped the benefit of recent economic resurgence.

The CBC budget includes a $100 billion investment in a national direct job creation program estimated to create 2 million jobs directly, as well as another 800,000 jobs indirectly in the private sector; $50 billion for school modernization; $50 billion for preserving teacher, law enforcement, and first responder jobs, good public service jobs that we all need; $230 billion for investing in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure; $50 billion in rebuilding America's neighborhoods; $13 billion in job training programs; and another $7 billion in summer jobs programs.

Our significant investment in jobs is the core reason why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what's the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the time.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia. It's good to have debate. It's good to have choices. It's good to have options, but that doesn't mean every option is equally good. And we're faced with that situation right here, right now, and that's why I rise in opposition to the CBC substitute budget.

There are different ways to balance a budget. Many, most Americans, many of us here, think that taking 20 percent of the value of a country's GDP, like this Federal Government does and spends it, is more than enough to run it and most anything else.

But to be fair, there are other ways to balance, and one of those ways is to raise revenue. And I want to examine just a few of the ways that this substitute budget proposes to run the Federal Government by raising revenue.

□ 1320

I see from all the different ideas here that their intention was to take from whom they believe are the richest Americans, the wealthiest Americans, those who haven't paid their fair share, the 1 percent, however you want to phrase it, but let's look at it more closely.

One, taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income at a top rate of 39.6 percent, I think this budget forgets how many middle class Americans have 401(k)s, how many of us across the Nation invest in the stock market, how many union members still on the old pension plans, those dinosaur plans, still rely on the stock market for their retirement. What are these capital gains and dividends going to do to them? They're not the richest, for sure.

Taxing financial transactions at 0.25 percent of the asset's value, the same thing, Mr. Chairman. What about all the middle class individuals, so many Americans in this country that rely for their retirement not just on Social Security but on 401(k)s, union members who rely on pensions? And what's it going to be like for them when we're taking simply more from them from their retirement?

And then perhaps the most insidious, returning estate tax levels to 2009, not only are we taxing twice, but we are making it a bad thing, apparently, to pass on our hard-earned wealth to our children, our next generation. It's no way to run a country. It's immoral, in fact.

But let's assume all these tax increases. The fact of the matter is this budget still never balances, never comes into balance. And I was struck this morning, Mr. Chairman, by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, during his 1-minute speech, when he said, when you contract with somebody to borrow money, that's what debt is. You intend to pay it back. When you contract with somebody and have no intention of paying that debt back, that's thievery.

That's exactly what we're doing, Mr. Chairman, to the children of tomorrow, to the people that do not yet exist, that do not have a vote in this matter. That's why I rise in support, and I urge all my colleagues to defeat this substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget claims to be in balance, but it's only in balance if you assume they can raise $5.7 trillion in new taxes and they cut $2.5 trillion in health care and a trillion dollars more in a category that includes Social Security and pensions.

I'd also note that a great deal has been made about the capital gains and dividend benefits in 401(k)s. I would point out to the gentleman that in a 401(k) the people do not get the benefit of that deduction. They don't pay any tax at all as it grows. When they draw it out, they draw it out as ordinary income.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for your tremendous leadership in putting together the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget; also, our chair, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her very bold vision in helping to move this forward.

As a member of the Budget Committee, as I said yesterday, I've had a chance to get into the weeds of the Republican budget. And I can say with certainty that I strongly support the Congressional Black Caucus budget because it is pro-growth, pro-people, and pro-American.

I just want to follow up on the gentlewoman from Wisconsin's comments, Congresswoman MOORE, who so eloquently stated the jobs provisions of this budget.

Let me show you the chart with regard to the 5 million jobs that this budget creates. When you look at the fact that without the Congressional Black Caucus's budget it will take us until April 2015 to create enough jobs to take us back to prerecession employment, that is not acceptable with so many people in our country who are unemployed.

This budget enhances Medicare and Medicaid.

It cancels the devastating sequester and it reins in bloated Pentagon spending.

We actually end the Overseas Contingency Fund when the President's goal is accomplished in 2014 of bringing our young men and women home from Afghanistan. This is really a slush fund. It's not even funded through the Pentagon. It's a slush fund through somewhere over at the State Department.

This budget provides $230 billion to revitalize our Nation's infrastructure and creates a $500 million jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery.

To help families stay secure in their homes until the economy fully recovers, our budget also funds a restoration of critical unemployment benefits to the full 99 weeks.

Also, we support a real effort to eradicate poverty in America with the 10–20–30 formula, which targets resources to communities that need assistance.

And we call for a national strategy to eradicate poverty by cutting it in half in 10 years.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just also conclude by saying our budget protects the safety net and protects those initiatives which create pathways out of poverty, such as the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, the SNAP program, food and nutrition assistance, and the program that assists women with nutrition assistance when they're pregnant. All of these efforts are protected in the Congressional Black Caucus budget; whereas, the Ryan budget would cut these programs. These are needed desperately as we move to a pathway to prosperity.

Our budget is pro-American, pro-growth, and pro-people.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would just point out to the gentlelady that, in fact, multiple economists have looked at the budget that Republicans have brought forward, and a couple from Stanford had an editorial, I believe, in The Wall Street Journal this week and noted that their review, their study, their evaluation of the Republican budget actually demonstrates that 500,000 jobs would be produced in the first year in the Republican budget and 1.7 million jobs in the 10th year.

So if you want jobs, there's a way to get jobs created in this country, and it is to reward those individuals who are creating jobs. That's what the Republican budget does.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another new member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. Our friends on the other side have called for what they label a balanced approach, but let's look at the record.

Is their quench for new taxes insatiable? At the start of this year, they got $600 billion in new taxes due to the fiscal cliff bill that passed. In addition, they added another $1 trillion of new taxes, starting this year, for ObamaCare. A total of $1.6 trillion in new taxes have been added since New Year's. But before the ink was even dry, they began to call for even more tax increases. In fact, the budget that we're discussing here calls for an additional $2.8 trillion of taxes that will be paid for by hardworking men and women around America. Taxes like, if you sell your house, you'll have to pay an excessive tax on the gain from the sale of your house when you're in retirement.

What do they do with their new taxes? Do they take it and pay down the debt? No. Instead, they take these additional taxes and use it to spend more.

This budget is not content with ObamaCare that passed a few years ago, no. It expands that. I do commend our friends on the other side for at least showing your intentions that you're not going to be happy until every American is on socialized medicine. And this expands ObamaCare.

It also expands food stamps. At a time when projections are showing that our economy may improve, certainly we should see individuals moving away from food stamps and on to a job supporting themselves, but that's not what we're seeing. A measure of success of a society should not be how many people can we put on public assistance. The measure of success of a society should be how many men and women can we allow to help themselves.

But this budget does cut spending in one area. It cuts into our national defense, even more so than the President's budget that he submitted last year. So while we're increasing spending on things that would drain our economy and deprive our children of obtaining jobs, we're compromising the very defense of our Nation. And when does it balance? Never.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and urge you to vote ''no.''

□ 1330

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just before I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands.

First of all, the gentleman just complained about the ObamaCare taxes. What he didn't say is that the Republican budget keeps all the taxes; they just repeal the benefits.

The Republican budget also does not cancel the sequester. The sequester is estimated to cost 700,000 to 2 million jobs. They do not cancel the sequester. In fact, they have additional cuts that will even add to those job losses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for yielding, and for the excellent job that you and your team did on the budget.

The CBC budget is proudly a statement of CBC, but also of American, values. As a physician, I'm particularly proud of its investment in health. It protects and strengthens Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and children's health insurance; fully funds the Affordable Care Act, adds a public health option, and includes provisions that will reduce health disparities.

It fully funds the AIDS Drug Assistance Program, mental health and substance abuse, maternal and child health, community health centers, the Offices of Minority Health, and the National Institute for Minority and Health Disparity Research at NIH.

It preserves Healthy Start, funds programs to increase the number and diversity of the health workforce, and gives communities the tools to improve health and well-being through restoring programs like REACH, dental health projects, the National Minority AIDS Education and Training Center, and other related programs. And it ensures that minority physicians and those practicing in poor neighborhoods and their patients will have the benefit of health information technology.

The CBC budget in its entirety addresses the socioeconomic determinants of health, beginning with the 10/20/30 program to reduce poverty. All of these provisions will reduce health care spending in the medium and long term. It is a masterpiece of a budget, and I urge everyone to vote for it. And yes, we will not be happy until every American has access to quality health care.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side, please?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. May I inquire of my friend how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I think we have two more speakers, including myself.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am so very, very proud to be here in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This is a budget with a centerpiece: Job creation. This is a budget that is balanced. This is a budget that is in opposition to the Ryan budget that would slash and burn and cut and deny our senior citizens, deny our children, do away with Head Start and many programs that the American people deserve to have.

I am a member of the Financial Services Committee, now serving as a ranking member. I created the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a program that goes into communities that have been devastated by foreclosures based on the subprime meltdown that we had in this country, where so many people were tricked into signing onto loans and mortgages they could not afford. Thus, they went into foreclosure. These communities have been devastated with boarded-up homes, with stray animals on the property, with police and fire having to spend more money in these cities to try and upkeep them. The Ryan budget would do away with the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

The home values must be maintained in these communities. Some people are trying to keep up their homes, but with these boarded-up properties, the value of the homes go down. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a project that would revitalize the properties and put them back on the market as affordable homes. Instead of doing away with this program that helps to keep the value of our American citizens' homes, we protect it. The Ryan budget would do away with it.

Thank the CBC for understanding how to protect our neighborhoods, how to protect our consumers and our citizens, and how to make our neighborhoods safe, despite the fact that we almost went into a depression based on the financial services meltdown.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have one more speaker outside of myself, and then I will be pleased to close.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. We are prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the CBC for actually coming to the floor with a budget, something that the President of the United States has not been able to do four out of five times, even though it is the law of the land that he is required to do so. So I commend them for doing so.

We should look to see what is it that we agree with in this and what do we disagree with. We do agree on several points, such as that we want to have a just and fair Tax Code. We do agree, as we have in our budget, to make sure that we address the most vulnerable, those people who are out of work, the poor in the country, those who are trying hard to make ends meet, to try to end poverty as well, to try to make sure that there is health care in this country. But where we differ from the CBC is the impact that their budget would have on each and every one of these.

Their budget would have a devastating impact on those who are out of work, those who are trying to not just get a handout, but get a hand up; those who are looking for health care and not being able to afford it; those who are looking for health care from the Federal Government and realizing that within a short period of time, over the next decade, we will see, actually, the money in the Federal Government for the health care that they're receiving right now basically run out.

So that is why I applaud their attempt to come to the floor with a budget. But I ask them to take a look at what the impact of their budget will do as opposed to what the Republican budget will do. We will actually be able to create jobs in this country. We did so before in something called the JOBS Act, which we passed in a bipartisan manner.

We are going to take the next step to make sure that there is a level playing field in this country versus other countries, to bring back those jobs that have been lost to other foreign nations and bring them back into this country as well. We will be able to reform the system with regard to the poor. We will be able to provide for a system that provides for the American family in a fair and just Tax Code.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget reacts to this chart which shows the recovery over past recessions.

This recession has been deeper and longer than any others. We still haven't gotten the jobs back. At the rate we're going, we're not going to get the jobs we lost in the 2008 recession for another 2 years. That's why it's important that the Congressional Black Caucus has a budget that has $500 billion in jobs. That will create about 5 million jobs as soon as we can get the money out the door, 5 million jobs, which will significantly reduce the impact of that recession. That's in stark contrast to the Republican budget, which maintains the sequester. The suggestion there is that 700,000 to 2 million jobs would be lost.

So we have a choice: 5 million jobs or lose jobs. We have a choice in terms of investments in education, transportation, scientific research, investments in our future, or cuts in those investments.

We have a credible path to achieve the Simpson-Bowles 10-year goal rather than a budget that depends on $5.7 trillion in unspecified tax increases to offset their $5.7 trillion tax cut that they say is revenue neutral. Also, it is a budget that requires massive cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and other health care programs, pensions, and everything else that will adversely affect those most in need.

The one-third cut, 25 to 30 percent cut in Medicaid, we have to remember that two-thirds of the Medicaid expense goes to the elderly and disabled. What is their plans for them if you're cutting Medicaid by 25 to 30 percent?

We can do better. We can have a progressive, pro-people, pro-growth, pro-jobs agenda; or we can have the devastating cuts in the Republican budget, which has $5.7 trillion unspecified tax cuts in it if you believe they will come up with that kind of money.

□ 1340

I think we should make the right choice. That right choice is the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would, once again, remind my friends on the other side of the aisle and those listening that the Republican budget creates 500,000 jobs by the end of the first year, and it will result in over 1 million jobs in the 10th year. It's important to appreciate that. And I agree with my friend on the chart that he has about the jobs decreasing, the deepest and longest period of poor job growth in any recession. He's absolutely right. He's correct on that.

But what this budget does that he proposes is doubles down on policies that don't work. Spending money that we don't have is not a prescription for more job creation. A little honesty, Mr. Chairman, on this: only in Washington, as the American people know, is spending at a lower rate a cut. More spending at a lower rate in this town is a reduction, is a cut accused by the other side.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican budget increases spending on average 3.4 percent each year over the next 10 years. It's a responsible budget. It's a budget that actually gets to balance, which means that we don't spend money at the end of this budget that Washington doesn't have, and gets us on a path to paying off the debt.

It's that way that we realize that we can create jobs for the American people, we can ensure that young people in this country will be able to get out of college and be able to find a job in their sphere of education, and we can make certain that seniors have the kind of services that they need, the kind of things that have been destroyed by the current administration and by the budget being proposed on the other side. The Republican budget is a responsible budget.

I urge that Members of our party vote down the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chair, every year since 1981, the Congressional Black Caucus has offered a fair and balanced alternative budget.

The CBC Alternative Budget for fiscal year 2014 is a "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" budget. It acknowledges that only by investing in people can you build a bridge to a better America.

America doesn't need an austerity budget. Americans need and deserve more.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the CBC "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" Budget Alternative.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to ask my colleagues to reject the budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Republican led Congress and support the FY 2014 Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget, the Congressional Progressive Caucus Alternative Budget, and Democratic Substitute Budget. These budgets will protect our families, put Americans back to work, restore fairness to our tax code, and make critical investments in education, transportation, innovation, research, and job creation.

The proposals submitted by the Republicans would undermine vital programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP. The Ryan budget cuts programs that assist low-income families, communities of color, young children, students, older people, individuals with disabilities, the unemployed, and the uninsured.

Specifically, the CBC Alternative Budget proposes a balanced plan that focuses on economic growth, invests in communities, and creates economic opportunity for all.

The CBC budget:

Cancels the sequester; creates a $500 billion jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery; provides $230 billion in investments for America's crumbling infrastructure; reduces the deficit by $2.8 trillion over the next 10 years; addresses the Medicare Doc Fix;. protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and TANF; proposes the 10–20–30 plan which targets resources to the communities that need assistance the most; addresses health disparities through full funding for the Affordable Care Act and strong support for the National Institutes of Health.

Again, I ask my colleagues to vote against the Ryan Budget that does not balance the budget, and will harm our children, seniors, and the middle class, and to vote for resolutions that strike a sensible balance between revenue increases and spending cuts.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $2,007,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,539,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,090,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,312,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,467,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,594,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,731,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,890,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,090,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,311,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,521,978,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: −$30,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $268,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $483,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $533,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $563,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $565,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $581,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $606,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $633,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $660,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $689,833,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $3,490,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,802,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,699,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,661,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,745,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,912,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,085,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,236,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,394,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,628,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,786,461,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $3,446,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,737,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,694,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,664,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,736,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,873,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,044,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,180,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,349,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,590,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,735,162,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the

amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: −$1,438,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$1,198,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$604,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$351,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$268,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$279,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$313,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$290,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$259,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$278,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$213,184,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,613,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $19,003,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,279,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,296,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,853,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,392,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,427,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,907,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $12,796,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $14,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $14,748,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $15,161,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,497,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,842,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,995,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,418,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,799,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $653,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $627,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $533,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $532,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $530,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $552,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $564,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $578,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $566,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $602,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,707,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $65,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $74,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $65,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $63,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $64,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $66,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $67,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,420,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $32,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $44,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,747,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,305,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $52,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $53,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $54,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $55,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $58,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $59,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $61,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,084,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $18,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,531,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$26,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$22,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $25,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,422,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $263,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $264,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $266,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $242,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $218,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $194,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $145,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $126,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $128,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $130,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,190,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $55,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $34,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $37,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,057,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $395,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $432,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $254,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $144,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $136,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $142,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $137,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $139,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $142,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $145,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $148,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,217,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $372,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $433,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $517,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $623,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $659,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $696,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $695,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $743,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $731,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $776,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $820,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $817,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $870,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,771,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $507,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $525,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $547,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $546,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $593,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $608,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $631,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $631,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $691,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $738,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $738,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $787,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $893,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $893,155,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $633,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $703,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $730,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $717,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $642,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $606,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $609,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $630,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $648,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $672,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $685,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,911,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,038,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $148,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $159,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $169,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $179,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $175,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $174,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $185,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $190,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $194,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $207,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $204,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,814,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $56,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $73,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $67,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $69,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $71,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $73,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $75,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $82,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $85,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,045,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,579,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $332,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $379,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $433,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $433,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $526,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $629,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $701,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $701,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $763,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $810,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $852,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $852,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $890,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $890,245,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,809,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) State budgets have suffered significantly during the economic downturn. According to the National Governor's Association, half of all states are projecting lower total revenues in 2013 than they saw in 2008. To assist struggling states, the Back to Work Budget temporarily increases funding for Medicaid – the single largest portion of total state spending – through the Federal Medical Assistance Percentages program. This will help stabilize Medicaid, which is a vital program for low-income and middle-class families, providing health and long-term care services to those stricken with catastrophic illness, injury, or disability, or facing prolonged infirmity.

(B) The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expanded a number of tax credits targeted at working families to boost relief during hard economic times. The Back to Work Budget retains the improvements made to the Earned Income Tax Credit (qualifying children and phase-out range), Child and Dependent Care Credit, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit. These credits fuel demand for American businesses by putting money in the hands of families that truly need it.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For non means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) Medicare is a cornerstone of the American health care system for more than 45 million America seniors. It is an exemplary program that provides the most efficient care to a segment of the population that costs more to treat. The Back to Work Budget protects beneficiaries and makes the system even more efficient. It amends Part D of Medicare to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, which will save Medicare $157 billion over 10 years and will reduce costs for seniors. The budget adopts policies to prohibit ''pay for delay'' agreements that reduce competition and modifies periods of exclusivity to increase availability of needed therapies. The budget also accelerates the use of bundling payments as an alternative to fee-for-service payments. It builds on Affordable Care Act efficiencies in administration of information and payments. Using standardized electronic systems for administration information such as claims, billing, payments and eligibility creates a more efficient and less fragmented health care system.

(B) The bulk of agriculture commodity subsidies go to large corporate farms that grow commodity crops such as corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and soybeans. These crops are often grown using unsustainable methods that require high levels of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides, leading to polluted waterways and degraded soil. The Back to Work Budget eliminates certain commodity subsidies, which will save billions, while reducing environmental impacts.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in presenting our Back to Work budget, a budget of the Progressive Caucus of this House, we are first pleased to announce that in less than 48 hours, 105,000 citizen cosponsors have joined with us in presenting this budget. They are pleased to affirm, and the point of this is House Budget Committee chairman, Representative PAUL RYAN, has released a budget proposal that is the most reckless austerity plan he's ever proposed. Instead, we get a budget that will slow the economy and kill jobs.

We urge you to vote for the Progressive Caucus' Back to Work budget which will grow the economy, create 7 million jobs, and ask the wealthy and multinationals to pay their fair share so we can make investments in our people and our future—105,000 citizen cosponsors in less than 48 hours.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the Progressive Caucus, my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just congratulate everybody with the Progressive Caucus and thank all of the staff that did such a good job preparing this excellent budget which gives us an amazing choice as Americans to confront this jobs crisis. I'm so proud that our Speaker has told the world—Speaker BOEHNER—that the debt crisis is not immediate. He's right, it's not. But let me tell you what is immediate: the jobs crisis.

That's why the Back to Work budget brings down unemployment to 5.3 within 3 years by investing in people—our construction workers, our teachers, and our police officers. We're also fiscally responsible, reducing the deficit over the long run by $4.4 trillion.

The Republican budget makes the wrong choices for our country. I respect the fact that they have honestly projected a vision, but it's an austere vision for the American people. It's no surprise that this message lost the election that we just had. It was put in front of the people. They said we will have none of it, but the American people do want what's in the Back to Work budget.

Gallup released a poll that confirms what you and I already know, and that is that the American people want jobs, not austerity; 72 percent, Mr. Chairman, of Americans said that they support putting people back to work repairing our Nation's infrastructure, including a majority of Republicans.

Now, the fact is that the Back to Work budget is about putting people back to work. As the Speaker and I agree, it's not the moment where we need to clamp down on debt. It's the moment we need to put Americans back to work. So which budget meets the test? The Progressive Caucus budget invests at the level the American Society of Civil Engineers says is needed to close our infrastructure gap. The Republican budget cuts transportation by 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to get back to work, and let's pass the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, as they say, in opposition to the Progressive Caucus substitute. While my friends across the aisle are motivated by good intentions, I believe that their substitute is, frankly, a blueprint for fiscal disaster. Instead of restoring the certainty to the economy by promoting fairness and providing American families the opportunity for more prosperity, this budget is simply a black hole for American families.

I can at least give credit to both the Progressive Caucus and the Democrat Caucus for offering a budget because the President of the United States has failed to do so. As you are aware, on February 4, the President, as required by law, is to give us a budget. It's March 20 now; and the American people, well, we're still waiting. That is the fourth time in 5 years that President Obama has failed to submit a budget on time and failed to abide by the law.

The Senate Democrats, well, they're not much better. It has taken them almost 4 years to produce a budget that basically now increases government spending by $265 billion, taxes up by almost $1 trillion, and cuts health care providers by almost $300 billion. Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are nearly $4 trillion larger than those under the House plan.

So, today, we have a Progressive substitute on the floor. This budget will do what? It will raise taxes by almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years, including a new tax on carbon. $5.7 trillion in new taxes necessarily means greater tax burdens on who? The American family. These tax cuts put job creators in the penalty box again, and that means more Americans will be where? Without jobs.

These tax policies are deceptively sold under, really, a warped notion of what ''fairness'' is. The reality is this ''fairness'' of theirs is merely a heavy-handed government taking from one pocket and putting in another pocket.

This budget's tax policy is based on the equality of outcome rather than equality of opportunity. When he's talking about equality, Milton Friedman once pointed out that a society that puts equality before freedom will get neither. A society that puts freedom before equality, however, will get a high degree of both.

So true fairness is the freedom to manage and direct one's own life and one's own future. Those who take risks giving their all in the pursuit of the American Dream deserve to keep what they've earned. Those who work hard day in and day out, they deserve to keep what they've earned.

But the Progressive budget is nothing but regressive. There's nothing fair about this budget, especially to the risk-taker or to the hardworking American family. Their budget would spend nearly $9 trillion more than the Republican budget. Note, now, when I say those numbers—where does that money come from—that means from our children and our grandchildren. They ultimately will be the ones who will have to bear this burden.

This budget would also establish a government-run health insurance option under ObamaCare and let the government basically set price controls on drugs. What does that mean? That means for those who were around back in 1970s, I think that's most of us, price controls on gasoline. How did that work out for us? Not too long. Waiting lines for gas is one thing. Waiting lines, however, for lifesaving medicine is a whole other story.

This budget would also expand the current, broken, and failed Federal job-training program without any reform whatsoever. This budget calls for even more money for the bureaucrats in Washington with regard to education, and this budget calls for even more money into the broken-down highway transit system that we have in this country.

□ 1350

And this budget even fails in the government's first responsibility—providing for the common defense. This budget further goes and guts the Defense Department by calling for almost $700 billion in cuts to the Pentagon compared to our budget.

This Progressive substitute then would put this country basically on the wrong path. For that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote on this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, there is some adage about if you do the same thing over and over again without changing it, that that is a mark of insanity. That adage applies to the Ryan budget 2, the same as Ryan budget 1, and to 10 years of failed fiscal policy that our budget, by putting people to work, attempts to get us out of that fiscal black hole.

With that, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON for their bold and visionary leadership of the Progressive Caucus.

As a member of the Budget Committee opposed to the job-killing ''Pathway to Poverty'' Ryan budget, I stand in strong support of the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget. The number one priority of the Progressive Caucus budget is fixing the job crisis. That is exactly what we want to do in our Back to Work budget. That is what it does.

Most economists argue that job creation equals deficit reduction. The CPC budget asks the wealthiest 1 percent, Big Oil, and huge corporations to pay just a little more so we can invest in the American people and create 7 million American jobs.

Our budget saves over $1.8 trillion in bloated Pentagon spending by eliminating the Overseas Contingency Operations account, which really is a slush fund that has funded two wars off budget. We refocus our resources into a modern military able to face 21st century threats.

We also require the Pentagon, the single largest Federal agency, with the highest waste, fraud, and abuse, to pass an audit test and pass it now. It is the only Federal agency not subject to an audit.

Our budget replaces the disastrous sequester by supporting critical spending in education, infrastructure, and we reject benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give support to what is happening for the Path to Prosperity. It is a responsible budget.

And I also rise to encourage my colleagues. It is a good thing for us to come down and get a chance to talk about budgets and where we are headed. It is a good thing to propose multiple options to be able to have this kind of dialogue about where we are headed as a Nation. This is what is happening in the Senate this week as well. For the first time in 4 years, the Senate has an ongoing dialogue about budgets and about the future.

While almost $6 trillion of debt has been added to our children, we have not done a budget between the House and the Senate in almost 4 years now. It is time to be able to do that. I encourage my Senate colleagues as well, and congratulate them for also taking this up.

I do look forward to one day seeing the President's budget. I did see today in the news that the President has released his final four bracket for the NCAA men's basketball bracket, but we have yet to actually see his budget. At some point, we hope to be able to see our national priority be on budgets, not on NCAA brackets, in the days ahead.

The budget that we are proposing focuses on families that need certainty. The way that you budget and you plan for the future and the way to set aside finances for the future is some kind of certainty in what is happening. We don't have that right now as a Nation.

For most families that actually live month to month, they don't have a large amount of resources to set aside for future investment. If a ticking debt bomb is coming for them, they expect the people in Washington to actually pay attention to that so that the little bit of money they can set aside for retirement doesn't blow up in some giant debt crisis in the days ahead.

This is a moment to deal with our debt. The budget that we are proposing is a responsible budget that takes 10 years to slowly start to bring us back into balance. Only in Washington is a drastic draconian cut actually reducing the increase.

What the Ryan budget does, what we are proposing, is a 1.6 percent decrease on the increase. Right now, the Federal budget is scheduled to increase by 5 percent over the next 10 years. We will actually just increase the budget 3.4 percent. I would say that is fairly modest. That is a way to be able to deal with what is happening in the Nation, and it is also a way to deal with what is happening to come in the days ahead.

We are not promoting additional stimulus spending as the budget that is being proposed now is. A giant proposal for additional spending did not help us several years ago. What was promised right now is that we would be at 5½ percent unemployment rather than still hovering near 8 percent unemployment, as we have for so long now.

Jobs do not come from additional Federal spending long term. If you want real jobs, it has to be in the private sector. That is the only thing that can be sustained; otherwise, you are dependent year after year after year with additional taxes and additional spending. We need to have the private sector be engaged in this. The way to do that is to encourage the private sector with some level of stability.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the Back to Work budget. The Back to Work budget puts jobs first, which is actually the best way to reduce our deficit. Jobs equal deficit reduction.

Our budget will create nearly 7 million jobs and bring unemployment down to 5 percent in 3 years. It protects Social Security and strengthens the critical benefits of Medicare and Medicaid. Our budget responds to what the American people say they want: job creation, more revenues from those who can afford to pay, and smart spending cuts that target waste, not opportunity.

A new Gallup poll released today found that more than three-quarters of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, support Federal Government efforts that focus on creating jobs. Americans don't want austerity or tax cuts, more tax cuts for the rich. They want jobs, good jobs.

So you can vote for good jobs by voting for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman who played a critical role in fashioning the budget that is before us, the Republican budget, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, like speakers before me, I am thankful and appreciative that others are proposing substitute budgets. It is good to have options, Mr. Chair. It is good to have a debate. But not all options are equally good, so I rise against the substitute budget that is now before us.

Admittedly, there are a couple of different ways and a combination thereof that you can balance a budget: spending cuts—and, by the way, when a Federal Government already takes, on average, 20 percent of the value of all the goods and services that a country produces, a lot of us think that is more than enough to run the government and that spending reductions are actually the solution.

Revenue increases might also get you to balance. That is certainly what this Progressive substitute tries to do. Nearly $6 trillion in tax increases over the next 10 years. And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, they don't get to balance. It doesn't happen. $6 trillion more of the people's property this budget confiscates, and they still can't balance the budget.

Why is balancing the budget so darn important? Well, a couple different reasons. You cannot start paying off the debt until you get to a balanced budget so that you have a surplus to start paying that debt down.

So their intention, Mr. Chair, is not to pay down the debt. That is what they are stating in this budget, and, frankly, that's immoral.

If you intend to pay a debt back in any contractual situation, or even in this country's budget situation, it is called a debt. When you take money from future generations, when you take money from people that don't yet exist with no intention to pay it back, as this budget does, have no intention to pay it back, it is called thievery, and that's wrong. That is why this budget needs to fail.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, when, in the course of the last decade-plus, multinational corporations, billionaires in this country have been curried favor with tax breaks, loopholes that have allowed them to pay less than the average American, that has hurt the economy. And I would suggest that, aside from thievery, that is gaming the system and not sharing in the full responsibility we all have as Americans to take care of this country.

I would now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN.

□ 1400

Mr. POCAN. The number one issue before our country is not the deficit; it's getting the economy going and creating jobs. We have 12 million people who are still unemployed and millions more who are underemployed in this country. That's why the best budget we could put forward is one that creates jobs, not one that costs us 2 million jobs as is estimated by the austerity policies of the Republican Party. It's not just the Congressional Progressive Caucus that says this. Our Congressional Budget Office says that three-quarters of the deficit we're going to see in 2014 is caused by underemployment and unemployment.

The real enemy to deficit reduction is not a new made-up spending crisis; it's the need for jobs.

The Back to Work budget makes a real commitment to job creation, creating 7 million jobs and reducing unemployment to 5 percent within 3 years. It invests in education, in police, firefighters, teachers, infrastructure; and it ends the job-killing cuts of the sequester. Instead of balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class and the neediest, the Back to Work budget has the back of America's middle class, and it does it while responsibly reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. In recognizing that we can create the jobs and the prosperity by not raising taxes at the same time, I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. It's time for our Nation to get our priorities right; and according to the Constitution, there are only a few things that we should be doing here in Congress. One of them is to provide for the common defense; but, sadly, this substitute bill guts our national defense and leaves us very vulnerable as a Nation. Let's review where we've been.

A couple of years ago, Defense made some efficiencies under Secretary Gates and cut $78 billion. Then with the Budget Control Act, immediately, $487 billion more was cut from the national defense. Then sequestration has kicked in, which is another $500 billion from national defense, and this proposed budget here goes even beyond that.

Our Republican budget replaces cuts from the sequester back into the national defense and keeps it a priority. It makes sure our men and women in uniform have what they need, but this budget cuts an additional $658 billion from the Pentagon. Even Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta earlier said that, with sequestration, it would hollow out our forces. So, certainly, this would do even more.

With sequestration, if we don't replace it, which this budget does not, we're going to see 100,000 fewer soldiers and marines; the Navy will likely have to mothball 60 ships, including two carrier battle groups while a quarter of our bombers would be jeopardized; we would also see the elimination of 250 fighter aircraft and higher fees for military health care. Now, that's not providing for the common defense. In addition, if sequestration is not overturned, for which our budget allows, then we could see up to 2.1 million jobs cut.

They're calling this budget a Back to Work budget, but when our men and women in uniform come back from Afghanistan, instead of being met with ticker tape parades, they're going to be met with pink slips. It's wrong, and we can do better.

There are serious ramifications. Our budget replaces those cuts, and it's needed. There are threats in the world, and this is no time for us to be cutting our defense. We have Iran threatening not only our neighbors, but us; and it is getting closer to having a nuclear capability. We have even this week North Korea shooting off a missile and putting out YouTube videos of that missile coming here and hitting not only cities of the United States, but even the U.S. Capitol. In addition to that, there are radical Islamists around the world who still want to harm us.

Now is not the time to cut our national defense. We need to keep our priorities right. We need to provide for the common defense. We need to pass the Republican House budget and reject this substitute that will hollow out our forces and endanger our families.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The Back to Work budget sets a level of 2006 for defense. Pentagon spending has doubled over the last decade; 2006 was the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the war on terrorism. We just celebrated the 10th anniversary of Iraq. There has been $2.2 trillion spent on that war—a war, I might say, that was not paid for at all. This does not cripple defense; this merely brings it to a realistic level so as to share in the reconstruction of this economy of ours.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I want to thank Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA for their leadership with the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

I rise in support of the Back to Work budget. Let me just say it again—back to work. This is what this budget is all about, ladies and gentlemen—investment in our infrastructure. We have bridges that are falling apart, streets that need repair, water systems that need upgrading. We can create jobs. The Republicans and the Ryan budget talk about jobs. They talk the talk, but they don't walk the walk.

I tried to get an amendment on the TIGER program, which would increase the funding for jobs in transportation that we need so badly. They rejected that. They rejected that because they're focused on making sure that they give tax cuts to the richest people in this country, making sure that they keep those tax loopholes for the privileged—not investing in America's future and in America's growth.

The people are expecting us to make them their priority, to make sure that we are investing in opportunities for them, their families, their children, and their neighborhoods. No, the Ryan budget pays no attention to any of that. These privileged people on the other side of the aisle, who don't have to worry about jobs and who don't have to worry about any of that, deny the people the right to just participate.

Mr. GARRETT. I would ask the Chair how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. That being the case, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Back to Work budget is the first budget that recognizes the truth about our so-called ''deficit crisis'': we don't have one. Speaker BOEHNER and Chairman RYAN went on television on Sunday and said that there is no immediate crisis, that it is the unemployment numbers we should be worried about.

Now is not the time for austerity. It is the time for the government to invest where the private sector won't. They're sitting on their money, waiting. This is the time to bolster our new and growing industries, like biomedical research and technology. Now is the time to rebuild our infrastructure. Creating jobs, as this budget does, is the only way we will become self-sustaining. With lower unemployment, fewer people need public assistance, and more people pay taxes. That's how you shrink the deficit. That's fiscal responsibility.

My Republican colleagues love to talk about balancing household budgets. Well, I don't know any American family that would use its children's lunch money to pay down its credit cards, and that's what they're proposing in the Ryan budget. Most families choose to invest in college educations, health care and retirements, trading current debt for future returns.

It's time to choose what kind of country we're going to live in. Do we grow with education, investments and a strong social safety net; or do we cut our way to higher unemployment, instability, and class divide?

Mr. GARRETT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which will increase unemployment and savage Medicare and Medicaid and other programs that families depend on, mostly to finance tax cuts for the rich and partly to fix the deficit crisis that we have already tamed. In 2009, the deficit was 10.1 percent of GDP. Next year, it will be down to 5.3 percent. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget would make sweeping, regressive changes to the Tax Code, which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut averaging $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. With 12 million people searching for employment and with almost 5 million Americans without jobs for more than 6 months, we do have a jobs crisis. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of the Republican budget would be to decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percent, resulting in 2 million additional jobs lost in 2014 alone.

If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

□ 1410

In contrast, the Back to Work budget addresses the jobs crisis head on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year, by making stark investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transits. It protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and family support systems.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result has been a double-dip recession and 12 percent unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which is merely a repackaging of the same extreme agenda that the American people rejected last fall.

Simply put, this bill is a disaster.

The House Republicans' budget would again try to end Medicare as we know it by replacing the guarantee of health coverage with a private voucher program that would reduce benefits. This throws seniors back onto the mercy of the private insurance market, while every year giving them less and less of the health benefits they have earned through a lifetime of hard work.

The Republican budget would not only make permanent the arbitrary, across-the-board budget cuts known as 'sequestration,' it would go further—making even more savage cuts to domestic programs. Critical social services like food stamps, college assistance for low-income families, Section 8 housing, home heating assistance, and Medicaid—all would face drastic cuts. Under the Republican proposal, our transportation investments would be cut by 20% over the next 10 years, exacerbating the challenges posed by our outdated roads, bridges, and airports. The bill also completely eliminates support for PBS, NPR, AmeriCorps, and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The Republican budget makes all of these cuts while refusing to cut a dime of military spending. What's worse, the Republican plan actually reverses planned reductions to military spending by increasing cuts to vital social programs—a callously unfair proposal that will have terrible consequences for millions of American families.

To add insult to injury, the bill before us today would make sweeping, regressive changes to the tax code which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut that averages $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less, which is just one more reason why we must defeat this bill.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. What we have is a jobs crisis, with 12 million people searching for employment, and almost 5 million Americans without a job for more than 6 months.

In contrast with the Republican spending plan, the Back to Work Budget addresses the jobs crisis head-on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year by making historic investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transit. It would enable States and local governments to hire laid-off teachers, cops, and firefighters, putting them back to work in strengthening our communities.

The Back to Work Budget would preserve our commitment to seniors by making no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, while reducing health care costs by negotiating drug prices, increasing competition in the health care marketplace, and reducing fraud.

Our budget would also adopt a commonsense tax system that asks the wealthiest to pay their fair share while lowering the tax burden on middle class families. We would also extend the Making Work Pay tax credit to help low-wage workers get back to work and providing for their families.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of all of these policies would decrease GDP by 1.7%, resulting in 2 million jobs lost in 2014 alone. If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

The American people rejected this extremist ideology last fall, and I hope that my colleagues follow their lead and reject this bill today.

But the larger problem with the Republican budget is that it will increase unemployment and savage Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs that families depend upon, in order to fix a deficit "crisis" which we have already tamed. In 2009 the deficit was 10.1% of GDP. By next year, it will be down to 5.3%. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

Basic economics tells us that government should pay off debt during good times while protecting jobs and middle class security during bad times. By balancing revenues with investments and creating millions of new jobs, the Back to Work Budget would produce significant economic growth while reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion over 10 years.

But callous, unbalanced cuts to domestic programs, particularly of the magnitude that House Republicans are proposing, would spell disaster for our economic recovery.

While GOP leaders claim to be making tough choices when it comes to our spending priorities, again and again they seem to only be making the wrong choices. They choose tax breaks for millionaires and the largest corporations over tax fairness for the middle class. They choose to reduce access to health care by voucherizing Medicare instead of protecting the benefits that seniors have earned through a lifetime of hard work. They choose to avoid required reductions in military spending by instead cutting programs that feed hungry children, heat family homes, and make college affordable.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result is a double-dip recession and 12% unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

Mr. GARRETT. And just to take a word from the gentlelady from California, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who has actually walked the walk and created jobs to create more American prosperity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to the American people to produce a smart, responsible budget; a budget that balances, that encourages job growth, and supports job creators; a budget that simplifies our overly complicated Tax Code and lowers tax rates for corporations and the middle class.

This budget just doesn't add up. In fact, it further complicates the Tax Code and will greatly hamper job creation. It would create five new tax brackets for upper-income individuals and small businesses, and would raise taxes on hardworking middle class Americans. It's not good policy to raise taxes ever, and especially not in a struggling economy.

I know what it takes to run a successful business. I have owned and operated my small business for 41 years, and it was said I walked the walk, I talked the talk.

This budget won't work in the real world, and it won't work in any world. This budget contains trillions in new taxes, trillions in new spending, and adds trillions more to the deficit. Pretty soon this budget would need its own bailout.

The American people deserve better. They beg for the Ryan budget. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this substitute.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my Republican friends on convincing some Americans that the only thing they should be thinking about is debt and deficit. While it is important, we acknowledge that, even Speaker BOEHNER last weekend said that it was not an immediate crisis. But the immediate crisis is the jobs crisis, so we should be comparing these budgets based on who creates more jobs.

Now, the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget creates 7 million jobs in its first year with a jobs package that repairs 35,000 public schools, rehires 300,000 laid-off teachers, and boosts consumer demand with a tax credit for working families. I believe my friend who just spoke said that we raise taxes on middle class families. Not true. We actually cut taxes on middle class families.

The Republican budget would kill 2 million jobs in its first year by slashing investment in research, education, and public safety.

Now by a job-to-job comparison, not just a debt-to-debt, deficit-to-deficit comparison—again, an important thing, but not the most important thing—on the jobs measure, the Back to Work budget is superior in every way to the Republican budget. It puts people back to work doing jobs that need doing.

The American Society of Civil Engineers, experts who are completely nonpartisan, have said we have $3.3 trillion in unmet maintenance needs. We make a downpayment on that infrastructure gap, and we put Americans back to work with the Back to Work budget.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has the right to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Back to Work budget is a budget that is common sense, and it reflects the values of the American people. It is a budget that deals with the realities of our economic times and our social times in this country.

This budget is about investment. It's about saying that the greatest resource we have in this country is the American people. We need to put them to work. We need to educate them for the future, and we need to provide them with some economic security for the middle class, working people, so they, too, can enjoy the economic benefits of this great Nation of ours.

We also do not step on those who are the most vulnerable. We provide them with the security, with Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, so that they, too, can continue to utilize the full benefits of those earned benefits that they have.

This fiscal debate today with the Ryan budget, too, and the other good budgets that have been proposed today is really an argument and a debate about the values and the future of this Nation. The Back to Work budget accepts the reality that we're in. It does not try to repeat a failed policy of the past, and takes us in a direction that in 10 years—and in 10 years, this country will be more solvent, more secure, and unemployment will be down and the investment in this time will pay off tremendous dividends for the future. Our budget is about the future. It is not about being mired in the past, as the Ryan budget is.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, so here we are at the end of the debate, and where are we?

The Progressive substitute, what would it do? It would raise taxes on the American family. It would increase spending throughout the country. It would put programs such as Medicare, to allow them to go bankrupt, if you will, within the decade, in 2023. It would do all this and put the burden on our children and never, ever balance.

In contrast, before us is the House Republican's Path to Prosperity. What does it do? It takes the first step. It takes the very first step toward reversing this trend, this path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats on that side of the aisle, and the Senate Democrats as well, have laid out for the American people. See, the Republican budget stops spending money that we do not have. The Republican budget simply does the right things in this area.

The Republican budget fixes our broken Tax Code. It does away with all of those unfair corporate deductions and the like that we've talked about. There is some commonality there. So it fixes our broken Tax Code, and it does so in a way at the end of the day creates jobs, increases wages, and helps the American family. The Republican budget will protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, not allowed by the other side of the aisle. The Republican budget will also reform our welfare programs, such as Medicaid, so they can actually deliver on their promise and not go bankrupt.

Every American family, every family in this country understands the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and the Democrats could surely learn by talking to them across the country. Budgets are more than numbers. Budgets basically come here to Congress and set priorities, if you will; and beyond that, they have real impact on human beings.

Unlike the Progressive substitute that's before us right now, the Path to Prosperity will provide real economic security for workers, for parents. It will ensure security retirement for the elderly and our seniors. It will expand opportunity for the young. For that reason, I urge this Chamber to vote on the side of freedom and opportunity and reject the Progressive Caucus budget substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Grijalva substitute amendment.

The amendment before us right now does nothing to get our nation back on a sustainable spending path. Instead, it proposes devastating cuts to the Department of Defense that would threaten our national security. It does nothing to protect the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. And this budget further complicates the tax code by creating five additional income tax brackets.

Americans are in this economic crisis together. We must work together to overcome these challenges that are having devastating effects on our economy, the jobs market, and could seriously hinder the standard of living for the younger generations.

The House budget, the Republican Path to Prosperity, builds upon the bipartisan Fiscal Commission which my bill, the 'Bowles–Simpson Plan of Lowering America's Debt Act,' also does. To be effective, Congress must eliminate waste and restore fiscal discipline to the government. The Simpson–Bowles Commission has given us a framework to implement targeted cuts so we don't have to subject the American people to arbitrary across–the–board–cuts again. The budget before us today is the way to go.

At a time when our country is more than $16 trillion in debt—all of which is saddled on our children and grandchildren—Congress must act to end the years upon years of rampant, runaway federal spending that has occurred under both political parties.

It's Congress' job to pass a budget that is balanced and carefully spends Americans' hard–earned tax dollars. I urge my colleagues to reject the Grijalva amendment and instead implement the House Republican budget, the responsible, balanced budget which builds on the Simpson–Bowles Commission's suggestions, and will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs across America.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–21 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment no. 1 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment no. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment no. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 261, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—154

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—261

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1446

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, SCHWEIKERT, BARBER, DUNCAN of South Carolina, GOSAR, ROONEY and BARTON, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, NEAL and TONKO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 305, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—105

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Deutch
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—305

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Hurt
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman

□ 1456

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I was detained and missed this vote for the RECORD. I support this amendment and would have voted for it. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 84, the Scott of VA Substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 25, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 84. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 327, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—84

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Tierney
Tonko
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—327

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock

Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2.569,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,736,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,855,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,977,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,094,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,226,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,394,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,583,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,758,528,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: -$42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$48,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$66,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$71,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$76,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$82,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$88,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$95,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,731,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,637,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,784,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,879,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,949,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,107,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,214,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,321,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,444,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,514,166,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,776,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,691,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,851,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,924,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,060,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,175,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,279,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,430,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,470,191,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: -$538,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$122,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$41,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $52,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $34,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $50,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $114,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $153,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $288,337,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $17,770,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,078,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,314,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,575,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,835,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,150,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,468,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,747,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $19,992,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,141,240,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $12,843,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,061,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,195,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,302,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,381,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,531,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,696,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,839,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,984,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,032,720,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $579,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $352,461,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $369,105,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $369,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $406,832,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $406,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $472,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $472,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $540,485,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $540,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $590,567,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $590,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $632,916,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $632,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $657,623,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $657,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $678,208,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $678,208,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $688,759,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $688,759,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $1,819,103,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,845,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $1,694,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,758,667,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $1,792,498,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,800,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $1,808,890,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,803,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $1,796,408,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,801,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $1,891,517,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,869,054,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $1,942,030,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,928,797,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $2,010,172,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,993,333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $2,094,647,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,102,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, $2,136,766,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,120,971,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than May 31, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(4) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(5) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(6) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(7) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(B) The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2013, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $42,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and by not more than $685,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Veterans Health Care Budget and Reform Transparency Act of 2009 provides advance appropriations for the following veteran medical care accounts: Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities.

(2) The President has yet to submit a budget request as required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, including the request for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for fiscal year 2014, hence the request for veteran medical care advance appropriations for fiscal year 2015 is unavailable as of the writing of this concurrent resolution.

(3) This concurrent resolution reflects the most up-to-date estimate on veterans' health care needs included in the President's fiscal year 2013 request for fiscal year 2015.

(b) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (c), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (d)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations''.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $55,483,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

(C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 302. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly.

SEC. 303. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPLEMENT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND TO FUND VETERANS' PROGRAMS AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—(A) The President has not submitted a budget for fiscal year 2014 as required pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, by the date set forth in that section.

(B) In missing the statutory date by which the budget must be submitted, this will be the fourth time in five years the President has not complied with that deadline.

(C) This concurrent resolution reflects the levels of funding for veterans' medical programs as set forth in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(2) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

(3) REVISED CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE BASELINE.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical and economic assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through fiscal year 2023 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of $5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 305. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 306. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—(1) The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 604.

(2) Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation of new budget authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for that fiscal year to be exceeded or the sum of the limits on the security and non-security category in section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act as reduced pursuant to such section.

SEC. 307. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan guarantees are treated unequally in the budget. The Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal housing programs on the basis of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (''FCRA'').

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, cash-basis accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate risks such as prepayment and default risk.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $635 billion of loans and loan guarantees issued in 2013 alone would generate budgetary savings of $45 billion over their lifetime using FCRA accounting. However, these same loans and loan guarantees would have a lifetime cost of $11 billion under fair-value methodology.

(4) The majority of loans and guarantees issued in 2013 would show deficit reduction of $9.1 billion under FCRA methodology, but would increase the deficit by $4.7 billion using fair-value accounting.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(c) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a cost related to a housing or residential mortgage program under the FCRA, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such cost.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

SEC. 308. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 309. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2014. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2014, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 310. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed.

SEC. 402. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(2) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately $10 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(3) Today, there are approximately 70 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) Taxpayers deserve clear and transparent information on how well these programs are working, and how much the Federal Government is spending on means-tested welfare.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 403. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING FEDERAL REGULATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the cost of regulations on job creators should be reduced by enacting title II of the Jobs Through Growth Act (H.R. 3400), as introduced on November 10, 2011. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should also be enacted.

SEC. 404. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 51 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in and near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2023 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.4 percent per year on average over the next ten years, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 6.4 percent of GDP by 2035 and 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution—

(1) to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress; and

(2) that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should be enacted

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs, including an option to remain in the traditional Medicare fee-for-service program.

(3) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(4) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long term.

SEC. 405. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remain available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Federal Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 406. POLICY STATEMENT ON BLOCK GRANTING MEDICAID.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act of 2013 (H.R. 567, 113th Congress).

SEC. 407. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this budget that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 408. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE USE OF OFFICIAL TIME BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR UNION ACTIVITIES.

It is the policy of this budget that, as called for in the Federal Employee Accountability Act of 2013, Federal employees shall not use official time to conduct union activities.

SEC. 409. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.

It is the policy of this budget that a new committee, styled after the post-World War II ''Byrd Committee'' shall be created to act on GAO's annual waste and duplication reports as well as Oversight and Government Reform Inspector General reports.

SEC. 410. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this budget that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 411. POLICY STATEMENT ON READABLE LEGISLATION.

It is the policy of this budget that bills should be made more readable and for Members of Congress and more accessible to the public as called for in the Readable Legislation Act of 2013.

SEC. 412. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this budget that the work requirements in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program should be preserved as called for in H.R. 890, 113th Congress.

SEC. 413. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production. To ensure States' rights, states are given the option to withdrawal from leasing within certain areas of the OCS. Specifically, a State, through enactment of a State statute, may withdrawal from leasing from all or part of any area within 75 miles of that State's coast.

SEC. 414. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

The Environmental Protection Agency is prohibited from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

SEC. 415. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATING A COMMISSION TO ELIMINATE WASTE AND DUPLICATION.

It is the policy of this budget that a new commission styled after the ''Byrd Committee'' shall be established as called for in H. Res. 119., as introduced on March 14, 2013.

SEC. 416. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed so that it is easier to reduce Federal spending than it is to increase it by enacting reforms included in the Spending, Deficit, and Debt Control Act of 2009 (H.R. 3964, 111th Congress).

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under P.L. 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2014, the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, or the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 509. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending programs.

TITLE VI—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 601. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit; or

(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this resolution, the terms ''congressional earmark'', ''limited tax benefit'', and ''limited tariff benefit'' have the meaning given those terms in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013.

(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—This resolution shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality, or congressional district.

SEC. 602. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The House Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in the first section of this resolution.

TITLE VII—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 701. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget converts the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, indexed for inflation and population growth. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that has tied the hands of State governments. Instead, each State would have the freedom and flexibility to tailor a Medicaid program that fits the needs of its unique population. Moreover, this budget repeals the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of its crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget converts the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, increases in the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most. Additionally, it requires that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Those in or near retirement will see no changes, while future retirees would be given a choice of private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I bring a budget today, a substitute, on behalf of the Republican Study Committee, a budget that balances the Federal budget in just 4 years. It does that, Mr. Chairman, by setting priorities for this Nation, priorities that our constituents back home know need to be set.

I want to begin, Mr. Chairman, by showing you the priorities as they relate to revenue and spending. Within 4 years, we bring revenue above the level of spending so that we can begin to repay our debt and eliminate our deficits for the first time since the Clinton administration, which will bring deficits and revenues in line, Mr. Chairman.

What we do is we prioritize those programs that are important to so many Americans. As you see from this chart, Mr. Chairman, Social Security spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Social Security trust fund; Medicare spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Medicare trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, if a budget is nothing else, it is a statement of our values and our priorities. And the Republican Study Committee's value and priority is to end the passing of responsibilities from this generation to the next, to be responsible for the bills that we create today and pay for those priorities today.

In 4 short years, Mr. Chairman, we can be out of this conversation about debt and deficit and begin the conversation about freeing the next generation from the $16.7 trillion that you and I and previous Congresses have racked up on their behalf.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we had a discussion yesterday and today about different approaches to the budget, and we've had a discussion about the Budget Committee budget, the Ryan budget, that was on the floor and will be voted on later.

That budget, of course, is an uncompromising budget. If you look at this budget, it's even worse. And on top of that, this budget has even more gimmicks than the earlier budget that we talked about.

□ 1510

So what are those gimmicks? Well, first of all, this budget says it comes into balance in 4 years. Look, if you want a race to a fake balance, obviously you should vote for this one over the Republican caucus budget. But the reality is, it gets to that balance by keeping the savings from ObamaCare, which our Republican colleagues say they want to eliminate, that they want to repeal.

You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation did a quick action alert on this budget. Here is what they say: ''Another failing of this RSC budget is that, like the committee budget''—in other words like the principal Republican budget—''it keeps revenues near the levels reached with ObamaCare tax hikes even though it repeals the health care bill's spending provisions.''

So let's just be really clear what that means for the American people. They are repealing the spending provisions. That means they are getting rid of all the benefits in the Affordable Care Act, including the provision to make sure that your child can stay on your insurance policy until they are age 26 so a family is not bankrupted by an accident or some disease that their child gets. It means the provisions that make sure people can't get denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, that is gone. So they get rid of all that, but they keep the ObamaCare taxes. That is what the Heritage Foundation says.

Guess what? They also keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act in the Medicare area that we achieve by ending the overpayments to some of the insurance companies and other changes in the incentive structure. We did it without hitting beneficiaries. They have railed against that in the past, but it is right here in their budget.

And here is the catch: they say their budget gets a surplus in just 4 years. Well, the surplus is $22 billion, they claim. But here is how much of it comes from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. They have got a little under $100 billion in revenue that year coming in, and then they have got Medicare savings. So not close to balance in 4 years without those provisions, which, as the Heritage Foundation points out, are in there.

And do you know what? Even at the 10-year window, even at the end of the 10-year window, they claim to have a $246 billion surplus, and yet they wouldn't get there without the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare.

That's a hoax. To come to the floor and say you will have a balanced budget in 4 years or 10 years, but guess what, you are going to repeal ObamaCare, your budget doesn't work when you do that. That just doesn't add up.

Now, they have another big sort of gimmick in this one that is not in the other Republican budget that has to do with taxes. So the problem with the main Republican budget is that it will provide tax breaks to very wealthy people and help finance those tax breaks by bringing down those rates by raising the tax burden on middle-income people.

As we discussed earlier, we actually put that question to the test in the Budget Committee. We offered an amendment that says: Well, when you do tax reform, don't make it a Trojan horse for raising middle class taxes to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Protect the American middle class from tax increases. A simple amendment. Every Republican on the committee voted ''no.'' So that is their problem with the main Republican budget.

This one has another problem. It creates two tax systems and says: Taxpayer, you get to choose. And then it assumes that they are going to choose the one that is worst for them. Because if they choose the one that is better for the taxpayer, from the taxpayer's perspective they don't have enough revenue in their budget to come to balance.

Now, look, the American people are smart. If you give them two choices, obviously people are going to add them up, and they are going to pick the tax return where they pay less. And if the American people are as smart as I think they are, they will blow another hole in this RSC budget.

So I am not even beginning to talk about the fact that they, once again, more than double the sequester cuts to places like NIH and places where we do scientific research, that they slash our investment in infrastructure. They do all that. They do even more of that than the other Republican budget, but it has the same fundamental gimmick with respect to ObamaCare. And then on top of that, it has this other tax gimmick in it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, while I regret the Rules Committee didn't give us more time to correct that misinformation, they did give us wonderful speakers. I would like to yield 4 minutes now to a former chairman of the Republican Study Committee, a former chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and thank him for his leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from so many of our colleagues that budgets are about priorities, and I believe this to be true. So what does it say about Democrats' priorities when the President is almost 2 months late in submitting his budget, and Senate Democrats have taken over 4 years to even bother to write a budget?

I suppose it says, Mr. Chairman, that budgets have a way of getting in the way of Democrats as they wish to tax us more, as they wish to borrow more money from China, money our kids have to pay back, and budgets get in the way of Democrats wanting to spend more of our money on a Washington insider economy that doesn't work for the rest of us.

We know that ObamaCare just raised $1 trillion of taxes, much of it falling on working families. The so-called ''fiscal cliff'' raised taxes almost another $700 billion, much of it falling on small business owners who can no longer offer raises, promotions, or even hire new workers. And now all these Democrat budgets are looking for an additional trillion dollars of tax increase on top of that. That comes out to about $9,000 for every working household in America.

Mr. Chairman, that is not fair, that is not helpful to this struggling economy. No nation in the history of the world has ever taxed its way into prosperity. America will not be the first.

Mr. Chairman, no nation has ever spent its way into prosperity; yet the Democrat budgets continue a spending spree that is driving us towards national bankruptcy. A day of reckoning is coming. You cannot have Federal programs going at 2 percent, 4 percent, 6 percent, 8 percent when the new reality under this President is 1½ to 2 percent economic growth, and the family budget, which ultimately pays for the Federal budget, is stagnant.

The families that I represent in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas have several concerns. They want to feel more secure in their jobs. They want to quit seeing their paychecks shrink in the face of higher prices. They want a healthier economy where their success is dependent upon how well they work, not on who they know in Washington. In other words, they don't want a Washington insider economy where they can only succeed if Democrats choose to invest in them.

Mr. Chairman, not every American belongs to a government employee labor union that supported the President in the last election. Not every American has a failing bankrupt solar energy company. So for the rest of them, these hardworking Americans, they want an opportunity, and they want a Main Street economy that, if they work hard and they play by the rules, every American can succeed.

And, finally, the people I represent believe it is just immoral, immoral to saddle our children with this trillion dollars of debt. That is why I am proud to support both the Republican Study Committee budget and the House Republican budget. They will help bring us a vibrant, competitive economy through pro-growth tax reform, a whole new Tax Code which is fairer, flatter, simpler, and more competitive, a budget that is guaranteed to grow jobs and paychecks. And contrary to the Democrat budget, no tax increases on anybody.

□ 1520

We quit spending money we don't have, and I know my Democratic colleague is very sensitive about the balance issue because they have a budget which never balances. The American people demand one; the Republican Study Committee and the House Republican budget deliver it. For a fairer economy, for a balanced budget, for a greater future for our children, we need to support these Republican budgets.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our budget focuses first and foremost on jobs and getting the economy growing. It does balance in the same time that the Republican budget last year balanced. And unlike the Republican budget, the main one, we do not give tax breaks to the folks at the very top financed by increasing taxes on middle class taxpayers.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a great new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle constantly say we should act like families and small businesses who balance their budgets. So let's look at families and businesses in this country.

The fact is that most American families don't have a balanced budget. When you graduate college, you get a mortgage or you go into debt, either way. Many families are suffering through unemployment or underemployment or even foreclosure. When you lose your job or your house, you don't just pack it in and say, Well, I don't have a job anymore, so no more food for me. No, you get your suit cleaned, get out there and interview. You get your résumé professionally printed. You invest in training courses to make yourself more marketable. You spend money to make money.

It's the same thing for businesses. Small businesses are not profitable right away. Businesses take time to pay off a lot of start-up costs like equipment, inventory, insurance, and training. Businesses have to invest to make business work. Sometimes your business goes into a slump. So you train your employees, you buy new inventory and invest in your company so it will grow. You don't just stop investing.

Mr. Chairman, the logic that they use to create this fiction that responsible businesses and families are always in balance is simply not true. Just like folks who are out of work or need to clean their suit and improve their skills, we need to build infrastructure and train our workers. Just like businesses who need new inventory and new ways to sell, we need to find new technologies to build here at home and invest in the education of our future workforce.

The very examples that they use of families and small businesses are simply examples that demand investment, not austerity. You dress for the job you want, not for the job you have. Let's pass a budget that invests in our country, in our future, starting today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in strong support of the RSC budget that we have here today, and I want to talk about a few of the great things that it does to get our economy moving again and get our country back on track.

The first thing that it does, it balances in 4 years. That's right, we really do think it's an important priority of this country that we balance the Federal budget. I have a 6-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, and I don't think that it's asking too much that we balance the Federal budget before they graduate from high school. And so we do that.

What else do we do with this budget? We get our economy moving again through tax reform that's pro-growth oriented and actually lower overall rates and close loopholes so that we can create jobs and be competitive again and get the country moving on track again.

Another thing we do, we save Medicare from bankruptcy. On the current path, according to President Obama's own Medicare actuaries, right now Medicare is scheduled to go bankrupt in 11 years. We don't think it's responsible to let that happen, so we actually put a plan in place to save Medicare from bankruptcy and ensure it for future generations.

We also repeal the job-killing ObamaCare, and not just the policies behind it, but all the taxes, many of which fall on middle class families, by the way. And so that's going to help get our economy moving again.

But let's contrast this vision, this document that's being criticized by my friends on the other side, with the President's budget. What's the President's budget? It doesn't exist. Today the President released his Final Four picks. He released his brackets. He's not a day late on that. Yet, under the law, the President is now 45 days late on releasing his budget. So what kind of set of priorities does that show, the fact that the President doesn't think that it's important enough to meet the legal deadline to file his own budget, he's 45 days late, and yet we know his Final Four picks?

So we have a plan to get the economy moving again. We're laying this plan forward to get a balanced budget and to get our economy moving and start putting some pro-growth policies in place so we can create jobs in this country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to a distinguished new Member from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain my strong opposition to the Republican budget and strong support of the Democrat budget amendment because it offers a balanced approach that is fair to seniors, the middle class, and invests in the right priorities.

I want to give an important example. My district is filled with people from all walks of life—teachers, entrepreneurs, and nurses—who've worked hard and spent their lives earning the Medicare guarantee. They live with the comfort of knowing that if they get sick or injured, the health care they've earned will be there for them. I know this firsthand. My own mother beat cancer with the help of Medicare. Fortunately, I didn't have to make the choice that many Americans will face under the Republican budget: having to choose between helping a parent pay for a cancer treatment or saving for our own children's college tuition.

The Democratic budget, on the other hand, secures Medicare by stopping overpayments to insurance companies and incentivizing efficiency in our health care delivery.

Mr. Chairman, we were sent here to get things done, to solve problems and not to create new ones, and that's why I will proudly vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), one of the visionaries of the Republican Study Committee.

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of reasons that I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget. It repeals ObamaCare. It repeals the death tax. It repeals the alternative minimum tax. It authorizes the Keystone pipeline. It authorizes drilling in ANWR up in Alaska. But the real reason and the primary reason is that it balances, and it balances sooner rather than later.

The first 4 years of the Obama Presidency, our deficits approached $7 trillion. The President has yet to submit a budget that ever balances. None of the Democratic alternative budgets ever balance. The Republican Study Committee balances in 4 years. It reduces the deficit immediately, larger, and it balances.

If I were to come before this body and ask for an amendment to be made in order to spend an additional trillion dollars a year to infinity, I don't think too many people would vote for that no matter what was in it. That's basically what you do if you vote to pass a budget that never balances.

The Republican Study Committee balances sooner rather than later. It balances in 4 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership on these very difficult issues.

Mr. Chairman, if you like sequestration that cuts $1.2 trillion in discretionary domestic spending, you're going to love the Republican budget which actually quintuples that. And then there's the RSC budget that goes even further. So while the Ryan budget cuts almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years in investments, this budget, the RSC, cuts $7.7 trillion. Yes, it cuts funding, as the last speaker just said, but at what expense? At what cost? We are, with this budget and with the underlying Ryan budget, we are disinvesting in America. We are walking away from research and development investments. We're walking away from infrastructure investments.

□ 1530

We are walking away from STEM and education investments. Those are the three legs of a stool that makes a great country great.

George Washington understood that and was a big champion of infrastructure investment and education.

Abraham Lincoln understood that in the midst of the Civil War when he invested, and this Congress invested, in the Transcontinental Railroad, in the Land Grant Research College System, in the Homestead Act, yes, and even completing the dome of this building, because they understood it was important to invest in the future of this country.

These two budgets walk away from that future. In fact, they almost guarantee a bleak future for America with respect to the competition. The Chinese aren't making these kinds of mistakes, we should not either.

I urge defeat of both the RSC budget, Mr. Chairman, and the Ryan budget when it comes up.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to a colleague of mine from the great State of Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed by the sheer ignorance of the economic disaster that our country is facing. Not only are our leaders ignoring this crisis, they're denying there is even a problem.

This week we'll vote on six budget options, and five of them actually increase spending above today's level. Simply reducing the growth of spending will do nothing to address the economic emergency that we face. The idea that we're increasing spending, but not as much as the other guy, is severely misguided.

We have to dig deeper and make real, targeted cuts, and there has to be a sense of urgency about it. Only the RSC budget actually cuts our baseline spending level and will lead to a balanced budget faster than the alternatives.

We must live within our means.

I thank my friend, Congressman WOODALL, for recognizing that we need to cut the outrageous spending and offering this budget today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has the right to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my very good friend from Maryland, the ranking member of our Budget Committee. I thank him for his leadership, and for his common sense, and for advancing approaches that make the right investments in the right priorities in this country, investments that expand the middle class, investments that provide for a balanced approach and reduce our debt.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the RSC budget. As House Democrats, we believe that we need solutions-based budgets, not ideology-based budgets. We need solutions-based budgets that rest on three pillars:

Number 1, they take a balanced approach and reduce debt, because we need to reduce debt, but do it in a balanced way.

Number 2, they protect the middle class, because the middle class is still struggling. Make sure the middle class is protected.

And Number 3, they make the right and smart investments in the right and smart priorities, that don't ask us to forsake research and cures and treatments for disease, that don't allow China to move ahead of us in research and development, engineering, science and technology, that keep us competitive in the world.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. ISRAEL. So we want these solutions-based budgets that achieve these three critical priorities, and the way we get to those three critical priorities is through one thing, and that is compromise. It is the ability of both sides of the aisle to pursue these three priorities in a balanced way.

The budget before us right now is not about compromise, it is about ideology. It is not about common sense and solutions, it is about extremism.

The American people have sent us here to get things done, to find solutions to move them forward.

Let's not go backwards, Mr. Chairman. Let's not continue gridlock, Mr. Chairman. Let's find a balanced approach that rests on compromise and supports the middle class. And that is why I rise today in opposition to the budget before us.

I thank my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a gentleman who came into the House with me in 2010.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you today. And it's very interesting as we sit here and discuss the balanced approach.

How do you have a balanced approach, Mr. Chairman, if you can't have a balanced budget?

There are two different visions here. You either trust the people in Washington who have given us $16.7 trillion of debt, or you trust the American people.

What the RSC budget does is trust the American people with their money by taking back the big tax increase that was given to us in January, by taking away the big ObamaCare controls that were given to us in 2010, and actually returns that power to the States and to the people, and actually balances the budget in 4 years.

This is real progress. This is a returning to what the American people demand. And what we need to create growth and prosperity in America is to pass these types of budgets.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I'd inquire of my friend if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, we do not.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, you and all Members can find every word of this budget on the Internet at rsc.scalise.house.gov. This isn't just about trying to go through the math. This is about laying out priorities. That's what every budget is.

This budget provides flexibility to States to care for our poor and our underserved in our health care communities. This budget provides the flexibility to seniors to find doctors, doctors that are no longer taking Medicare today and are threatening the health care quality that folks like my mom and dad are having to contend with.

This is a budget that makes tough decisions. You're not going to find a family in this country, Mr. Chairman, that hasn't had to make tough decisions during tough economic times. And the question is, why won't the U.S. House of Representatives, why won't the U.S. Senate, why won't the United States President do exactly the same thing?

We're trying to fulfill that request of the American people today, Mr. Chairman, in this budget. Every word laid out right here talking about, Mr. Chairman, responsible budgeting, prioritizing, as we did, our seniors who are counting on Social Security, our seniors who are counting on Medicare, our seniors who are counting on the solvency of both of those programs.

We ensure that that does not continue, Mr. Chairman, because solvency is not guaranteed. In fact, it's guaranteed not to be there under current funding systems. We change those systems to ensure that it will be a sustainable path, Mr. Chairman, a path where revenues and spending align, radical idea for this Chamber. And you'll hear it described in radical terms by my friends, where spending and revenues align. We commit ourselves to that, and we achieve it.

They say that talk is cheap, Mr. Chairman. That's why we back up this budget with real ideas, real proposals, real solutions. But when they say talk is cheap, and as my colleague from Maryland begins to close, I want to observe that talk, in this case, is not cheap at all.

The words that you'll hear from the gentleman from Maryland, in opposition to our proposal, in support of his proposal, are the difference between the $33 billion surplus that our budget generates and the $5.11 trillion deficit that the gentleman's proposal creates.

These are not questions of math, Mr. Chairman. These are questions of what kind of future do we want to leave to our children and our grandchildren. I feel the burden of responsibility for the $16.7 trillion this Nation has already put on its credit card. We take difficult steps in this budget to begin to reverse that for the first time.

In the absence of this budget, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of powerful ideas, like what you see in the House Budget Committee budget, we relegate our children to a second-class future, a future in which they owe $5.1 trillion more than the already immoral debt load that they face today.

□ 1540

There is a better way, Mr. Chairman. There are alternatives in this town. We are presenting one right here. It's called the Back to Basics budget, Mr. Chairman. It's a product of the Republican Study Committee.

To close, Mr. Chairman, these things don't happen by themselves. While the President has been unable to produce a budget, we've produced five in this house. It's because of the work of folks like Nick Myers on my staff. It's because of the work of folks like Will Dunham on the RSC staff. I know the gentleman from Maryland has the same kind of hardworking team working with him. These things don't happen in a vacuum. They happen because folks put in hour after hour after hour. I'm grateful to them. I hope America will support the product of their minds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think the American people know full well that the best way to attack the deficit right now is to help put more Americans back to work. That's the sense in this country and that's what all the numbers show from the Congressional Budget Office.

If you take the austerity approach recommended in either this budget or the main Republican budget, we know from the referees, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that we'll see 750,000 fewer jobs just by the end of this calendar year. We also know you'll see 2 million fewer jobs next year, which is why we say let's focus on the jobs deficit and address the budget deficit in a sustained way where we bring it down in a balanced way, where we ask for shared responsibility and not another round of tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

And yes, we achieve balance in the same year the Republican budget last year achieved balance, but our priority is getting the country fully back to work.

We also believe that when we put together these budgets, we shouldn't pretend that you can have it all ways. And as I have said repeatedly, the Republican budget, including this RSC budget, is based, on the one hand, on the claim that it gets to balance in 4 years—one, in 10 years—but at the same time that they're repealing ObamaCare, and that just is not the case. It doesn't add up.

So if you're in a race to fake balance, then you should vote for this one because it gets to fake balance in 4 years instead of 10 years. But if you're in a race to put America back to work, you should vote for the Democratic plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia, Mr. WOODALL. I commend him on authoring this substitute amendment on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

At a time when we have over $16.5 trillion in debt, this budget reduces spending by $6.5 trillion over ten years and reduces deficits by $5.9 trillion. Furthermore, the Woodall amendment completely repeals ObamaCare, and it rolls back the tax increases associated with the fiscal cliff. In doing so, this budget decreases taxes by $685 billion over the budget window.

Mr. Chair, unlike any other of the substitutes offered today, the RSC budget will achieve balance by 2017 without holding funding for our servicemen and women hostage. This budget also significantly reforms our entitlement programs so we can ensure their long term solvency for future generations.

Mr. Chair, I believe that this is a sensible budget that puts the proper priorities in line. I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 132, answered "present" 171, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—104

Amash
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cassidy
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—132

Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Ellmers
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Joyce
Kelly
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schrader
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—171

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Clarke
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Foxx
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Matheson
Meng
Miller, George
Perry
Peterson

Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	
Schock	Wasserman	

□ 1606

Messrs. SALMON, MARCHANT and ROE of Tennessee changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. BARROW of Georgia and SCHRADER changed their vote from ''present'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio and COOPER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 86, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, my vote on rollcall 86 did not reflect the way I intended to vote. I wished to vote "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I was not present during the rollcall votes Nos. 76–86, on March 18–20, 2013. I would like the record to reflect how I would have voted: On rollcall vote No. 76 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 77 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 78 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 79 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 80 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 81 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 82 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 83 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 84 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 85 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 86 I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $1,982,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,242,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,693,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,903,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,032,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,162,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,287,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,428,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,606,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,807,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,996,779,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -$55,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$28,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $87,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $124,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $128,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $134,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $138,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $144,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $149,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $157,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $164,634,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $3,117,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,982,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,020,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,230,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,416,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,611,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,975,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,149,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,383,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,540,638,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $2,966,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,038,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,088,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,255,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,396,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,563,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,754,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,935,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,120,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,359,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,500,492,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -$983,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$796,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$394,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$351,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$364,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$400,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$466,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$506,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$514,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$551,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$503,713,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,158,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,142,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,519,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,996,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,567,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,340,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $12,340,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,215,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,702,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,141,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $14,589,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,065,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,616,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,858,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,558,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,232,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $559,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,639,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $54,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,430,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,021,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,950,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $39,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,935,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,721,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$30,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $150,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $109,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $116,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $96,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $102,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,921,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,870,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $160,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $83,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $92,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $102,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $115,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $120,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $116,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $117,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $119,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $121,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $124,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,856,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $365,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $420,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $501,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $555,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $612,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $649,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $733,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $765,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $764,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $808,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $857,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,154,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $511,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $527,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $735,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $863,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $863,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $895,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,764,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $544,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $538,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $538,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $545,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $557,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $571,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $598,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,842,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $47,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,848,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $146,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $59,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $63,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $65,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $71,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $73,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,433,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $37,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,056,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $331,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $343,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $371,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $419,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $607,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $681,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $681,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $748,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $748,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $803,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $803,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $856,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $904,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $904,907,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$16,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$26,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$31,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$29,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$33,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$39,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$37,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$44,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$42,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$49,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$46,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$54,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$51,947,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that protects workers and supports jobs by reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''clean energy jobs'');

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) enhances the delivery of health care to the Nation's veterans;

(2) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(3) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(4) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes improvements to Medicare, including making reforms to the Medicare payment system for physicians that build on delivery reforms underway, such as advancement of new care models, and—

(1) changes incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;

(2) improves payment accuracy to encourage efficient use of resources and ensure that patient-centered primary care receives appropriate compensation;

(3) supports innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings;

(4) holds providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care; and

(5) makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare;

by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

(2) Changes to foster care to prevent child abuse and neglect and keep more children safely in their homes.

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. When 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than to administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(c) HOME VISITING.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND COMPLETION.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable and increases college completion, including: efforts to reform Federal student aid policies to ensure that subsidized student loan interest rates do not double in July 2014 at the end of the one-year extension of the current 3.4 percent interest rate assumed in the resolution; or efforts to ensure continued full funding for Pell grants, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 211. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 301. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

(3) The resolution retains the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the

total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending: For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2015 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2016, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2014.

SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates $9,753,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $1,018,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates $60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $20,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 403. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2013 or fiscal year 2014 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2013 or the 2014 level for Overseas Contingency Operations in the President's 2014 budget and the new outlays resulting from that budget authority.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b) and (c) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 404. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 405. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 406. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 113th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

(1) (A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms ''budget year'', ''current year'', and ''direct spending'' have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ''direct spending'' shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4) (C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) a bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 407. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007 that was worsened by a financial crisis in 2008 – by January 2009, the private sector was shedding 821,000 jobs per month;

(2) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010, with the economy creating 6.4 million private jobs over the past 36 consecutive months;

(3) multi-year across-the-board spending cuts under sequestration will cost Americans millions of jobs with up to 750,000 jobs lost this year alone, slow economic growth by up to one third this year alone, and impair our global competitive edge;

(4) as part of a ''Make it in America'' agenda, U.S. manufacturing has been leading the Nation's economic recovery as domestic manufacturers regain their economic and competitive edge and a wave of insourcing jobs from abroad begins;

(5) despite the job gains already made, job growth needs to accelerate and continue for an extended period for the economy to fully recover from the recession; and

(6) job creation is vital to Nation-building at home and to deficit reduction – CBO has noted that if the country were at full employment, the deficit would be about half its current size.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ''Make it in America'' agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the U.S., and help middle class families by increasing the minimum wage.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) assumes enactment of legislation to replace sequestration under the Budget Control Act of 2011 with at least the same amount of deficit reduction from a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing that tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

(B) assumes enactment of—

(i) the President's $50 billion immediate transportation jobs package;

(ii) other measures proposed in the American Jobs Act and reflected in the President's 2013 budget; and

(iii) the President's proposed surface transportation legislation;

(C) assumes $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps;

(D) assumes $80 billion in education jobs funding for the President's initiatives to promote jobs now while also creating an infrastructure that will help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion for rebuilding at least 35,000 public schools, $25 billion to prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs, and $8 billion to help community colleges train 2 million workers in high-growth industries with skills that will lead directly to jobs; and

(E) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements and support for biomedical research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) every bipartisan commission has recommended, and the majority of Americans agree, that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the resolution that—

(1) the Congress should vote on H.R. 699, which would replace the sequester for calendar year 2013 with a balanced mix of targeted and better timed spending reductions and revenue increases to prevent the loss of jobs and the drag on economic growth in the near term; and

(2) the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Social Security is America's most important retirement resource, especially for seniors, because it provides an income floor to keep them, their spouses and their survivors out of poverty during retirement – benefits earned based on their past payroll contributions;

(2) in January 2011, 56.8 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of about $15,000, which is the majority of total retirement income for more than half of all beneficiaries;

(4) diverting workers' payroll contributions toward private accounts undermines retirement security and the social safety net by subjecting the workers' retirement decisions and income to the whims of the stock market;

(5) diverting trust fund payroll contributions toward private accounts jeopardizes Social Security because the program will not have the resources to pay full benefits to current retirees; and

(6) privatization increases Federal debt because the Treasury will have to borrow additional funds from the public to pay full benefits to current retirees.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Social Security should be strengthened for its own sake and not to achieve deficit reduction. Because privatization proposals are fiscally irresponsible and would put the retirement security of seniors at risk, any Social Security reform legislation shall reject partial or complete privatization of the program.

SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security;

(2) in 2012, 50 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system;

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(6) shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both; and

(7) versions of voucher or premium-support policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely cause traditional Medicare to weaken and wither away.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve families' health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;

(2) the Affordable Care Act signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to 27 million Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefitting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

(4) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health cost-containment provision experts recommend, including new incentives to reward quality and coordination of care rather than simply quantity of services provided, new tools to crack down on fraud, and the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and as a result will slow the projected annual growth rate of national health expenditures by 0.3 percentage points after 2016, the essence of ''bending the cost curve''; and

(5) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than $1,000,000,000,000 over the next 20 years.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million senior citizens, 10 million people with disabilities, and 14 million other low-income people who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

(2) senior citizens and people with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid program spending and consequently would be at particular risk of losing access to important health care assistance under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and people with disabilities facing significant costs for long-term care; and

(4) at least 70 percent of people over age 65 will likely need long-term care services at some point in their lives.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable Americans provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014.

SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none and the size and the structure of our military have to be driven by a strategy;

(2) those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them;

(3) a growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development;

(4) 750,000 jobs will be lost in calendar year 2013 if the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration remain in effect, hampering the economic recovery and jeopardizing the foundation of our security,

(5) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

(6) the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force concluded that a serious and balanced deficit reduction plan must put national security programs on the table;

(7) in 2011, the U.S. spent more on defense than the next 16 countries combined (and more than half of the amount spent by those 16 countries was from seven NATO countries and four other close allies);

(8) Admiral Mullen argued that the permissive budget environment over the last decade, a period when defense spending increased by hundreds of billions of dollars, had allowed the Pentagon to avoid prioritizing;

(9) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense — the last department still unable to pass an audit — such as the elimination of duplicative programs that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office;

(10) effective implementation of weapons acquisition reforms at the Department of Defense can help control excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and help ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(11) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(12) weapons technologies should be proven to work through adequate testing before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(13) the Pentagon's operation and maintenance budget, which now totals $200 billion per year, has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area;

(14) excluding those involved in war operations, 200,000 military personnel and their dependents are stationed overseas, and the Administration should further review the benefits and costs of alternatives to permanent overseas basing of personnel;

(15) more than 94 percent of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce since 2001 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense (31 percent), Department of Homeland Security (32 percent), Department of Veterans Affairs (26 percent), and Department of Justice (6 percent)—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

(16) proposals to implement an indiscriminate 10 percent across-the-board cut to the Federal civilian workforce would adversely affect security agencies, leaving them unable to manage their total workforce, which includes contractors, and their operations in a cost-effective manner; and

(17) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs;

(2) further savings can be achieved from the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our security strategy; and

(3) veterans programs are fully funded and if there is new information provided in the President's 2014 budget that would justify the need for funds in excess of the amount reflected in section 102(15), adjustments shall be made from within the discretionary totals to meet any such new requirements.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER AND REDUCE THE DEFICIT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the sequester represents a meat-ax approach to cutting government spending and will cost the economy 750,000 jobs in 2013 alone, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office;

(2) the House must therefore replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction that would raise revenues in addition to making targeted spending cuts;

(3) this balanced approach to deficit reduction must include overhauling our outdated

tax code –which contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests – to make it simpler, more progressive, and more competitive;

(4) these special tax breaks can greatly complicate the effort to administer the code and the taxpayer's ability to fully comply with its terms, while also undermining our basic sense of fairness;

(5) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(6) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes;

(7) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is badly in need of reform, and it proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way;

(8) even Speaker Boehner indicated that he has a plan that would raise an additional $800 billion in revenues through closing tax loopholes and eliminating special interest tax breaks.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to help reduce the deficit and replace the sequester through a balanced approach that includes limits on tax expenditures and tax breaks for very high-income individuals. This resolution expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-class taxpayers. This resolution also expressly rejects raising taxes on middle-class taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes below $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples) and reflects the tax rates and income thresholds established in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. This resolution therefore encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue needed through closing loopholes and ending tax breaks for special interests and the very wealthy, consistent with key proposals made by both the President and the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures.

(B) This resolution supports working families, encourages increased labor force participation, and boosts access to higher education by permanently extending the expansions to the child tax credit, the EITC, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit, respectively, first legislated under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

(C) This resolution extends policies that reinvest in domestic manufacturing to bring jobs back to our shores; builds up the renewable energy production capacity of the United States in order to limit our reliance on foreign oil while creating green jobs; expands access to higher education, which everyone agrees is essential for building up a highly-skilled workforce and building out the middle class; and supports saving and capital formation that will raise future standards of living.

(2) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution proposes eliminating unproductive or unwarranted corporate tax preferences and subsidies, as well as pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs – rather than products – overseas for tax purposes.

(B) This resolution adopts pro-growth corporate tax incentives like those in the President's FY 2013 budget proposals, such as: enhancing incentives for domestic manufacturing to support a ''Make it in America'' agenda, including providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move operations and jobs overseas; closing loopholes that allow businesses to avoid taxes, by subjecting more of their foreign earnings sheltered in tax havens to U.S. taxation; the research and development credit; and enhancing clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the President's proposals for business tax reform in determining how to best overhaul our corporate tax code so that it promotes economic growth and domestic job creation without increasing the deficit and the debt.

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The committee should also find ways to focus assistance toward struggling family farmers and ranchers in a manner that creates jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

SEC. 511. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barber shop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The prospect of upward mobility should be the right of every American.

(2) Targeted, means-tested Federal programs help lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

(3) These programs empower their beneficiaries through job training, educational assistance, adequate food, housing, and health care to rise to the middle class.

(4) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts over 4 million people out of poverty, including over 2 million children. It is particularly effective in keeping children – over 1 million – out of deep poverty (below half the poverty line). School breakfast and lunch programs help keep children ready to learn, allowing them to reach their full potential.

(5) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit together lift over 9 million people, including nearly 5 million children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed a major EITC expansion in 1985 and then referred to the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which included the expansion, as ''the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress''.

(6) However, some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Citizens of these areas often lack access to quality schools, affordable health care, and adequate job opportunities.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to support the goal of developing a national strategy to eliminate poverty, with the initial goal of cutting poverty in half in ten years, and to extend equitable access to economic opportunity to all Americans. As Congress works to protect low income and middle class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that millions of American families rely on to get by, priority must be given to creating a national strategy on poverty to maximize the impact of anti-poverty programs across Federal, State, and local governments. Improving the effective coordination and oversight across agencies and implementing a true unity of programs under a ''whole of government'' approach to shared goals and client based outcomes will help to streamline access, improve service delivery, and will strengthen and extend the reach of every Federal dollar to fight poverty. The plan should consider additional targeting of spending toward persistent poverty areas to revitalize these areas of pervasive poverty, unemployment and general distress. The plan must also include provisions that work to remove the barriers and obstacles that prevent the most vulnerable Americans from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities and moving up the ladder of opportunity to join the middle class and reach for the American Dream.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs ''could potentially save tens of billions of dollars.''

(3) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified opportunities for savings and improved efficiencies in the Government's information technology infrastructure.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(5) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2014, 42 laws will expire. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(7) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs may result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be changed.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1610

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, today we are offering a budget with commonsense solutions that first focuses on the issue that's most pressing for the country and the American people today: kicking our economy into higher gear and putting more Americans back to work.

We know from the Congressional Budget Office—the professionals—that one-half of this year's deficit is due to the fact that millions of Americans are still looking for work and that three-quarters of next year's deficit is because we're not at full employment.

Our budget goes to the heart of the issue. It attacks the jobs deficit because we know we can't get the budget deficit under control until people are back to work and we take a balanced approach to long-term deficit reduction where we ask for shared responsibility.

We do ask people at the very high end of the income ladder to give up some of the tax preferences and tax breaks they have in order to help reduce the deficit. It's very different than the Republican budget that doesn't close one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Theirs only lowers tax rates for folks at the very top by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans. We don't do that.

We make sure that people can get back to work by replacing the sequester, which we know will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working at the end of this year. We also have a jobs program investing in this country, especially in the area of infrastructure, to help rebuild our aging infrastructure and build the modern infrastructure that's necessary to compete in the 21st century. Those measures will make sure that, compared to our Republican colleague's budget, we have 1.2 million more Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million more by the end of next year.

We also make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors. Unlike the Republican budget, we don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, which will mean seniors with high prescription drug costs will have to pay thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget, and we don't turn Medicare into a voucher program that leaves seniors facing the risks and costs of escalating health care costs in the future.

We make sure that students don't face a doubling of the interest rate in July, scheduled to go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Republican budget keeps that doubling of interest rate in place. We don't.

We fully fund the transportation program for the next 10 years. The Republican budget cuts it by 20 percent, even at a time when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, we get at the budget issues by putting more people back to work, by dealing with this in a balanced way. We reduce the deficit way down so it's growing much slower than the economy. We stabilize the debt, and we balance the budget in the same time period that the Republican budget for the last 2 years had balanced the budget, but our focus is on jobs and the jobs deficit as a way to tackle the budget deficit.

With that, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague and friend, the distinguished whip from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. I first want to thank the ranking member for the work that he's done on this budget that he offers as an alternative.

It is a reasonable alternative that can be implemented. To that extent, it's a stark difference to the majority's proposal, which will not be implemented, and they know it.

Let me start with an observation, a headline, ''Blunt Report Says GOP Needs to Regroup for '16.''

In that, there is this sentence from the report. It's not from a Democrat, not from the newspaper, not from an editorial writer. It says, ''We have become expert''—''we,'' being the Republican Party.

We have become expert in how to provide ideological reenforcement to like-minded people.

With all due respect to my friend, Mr. RYAN, that's what his budget is: it is a vision. It is a vision that will not be implemented, and he knows it.

He knows that the Appropriations Committee will not be able to report out bills consistent with his budget, nor will the Ways and Means Committee come even close to reporting out bills that will implement his budget. Why? Because they're so draconian. And as I have said before, if every Democrat were taken out of this House and every Democrat taken out of the Senate, you would not implement the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has put together a balanced plan. Yes, it has revenues, and, yes, it keeps the Affordable Care Act in place, and, yes, it provides for funding for investment in growing our economy.

Mr. RYAN knows—and I have great respect for Mr. RYAN. I have great respect for his intellect and, frankly, from time to time, for his political courage. We voted together on TARP. It was a tough vote for him. It was a tough vote for me. It was a tough vote, period. But it was the right vote for the economy. We would have been in a depression had we not voted for that bill, and I congratulate Mr. RYAN on doing that.

But I'll lament the fact that we do not have an equally honest but tough resolution of a big deal in how to get from where we are—too much debt, too much deficit—to where we need to be: a fiscally sustainable path.

We will not get there, I tell my friend, by vision alone. Courage will be much more important than vision in that case. And Mr. VAN HOLLEN has shown courage by offering a budget that will provide for our people, for our country, and for our economy.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative. Why? Because it is a responsible, fiscally implementable—there's a word for you—fiscally doable alternative.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Ezra Klein, who may not be your favorite writer, says:

Ryan's tax reform plan costs more than all his spending cuts combined.

That's why I say it can't be implemented. And if we were in private and there were no politics involved, I think my friend would admit that. He shakes his head ''no.'' I didn't expect anything different than that.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an important statement of vision. It's an important statement of what our priorities are. It's an important statement to the American people, to seniors, to students, to families, to children where our priorities are.

The Van Hollen priorities are the right priorities for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative.

□ 1620

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I enjoyed my friend from Maryland, and I appreciate his attempt to speak on my behalf. I will just try to do that myself. There is one thing that is identical in this budget—the base budget—and the Senate budget: it's the appropriations No. 966. It's the one thing that is equal in both the House and the Senate budgets.

The reason I rise in opposition to this budget, unlike what the gentleman just said, is that there is no way this could pass. I would say the opposite. Why? This budget never balances the budget.

You will hear Mr. VAN HOLLEN claim that, in 2040, because of certain assumptions they, on their own, make and that cannot be verified by the CBO, they think they'll balance. It never, ever balances the budget. Here is why:

We are going to go from a $16-plus trillion debt to a $25 trillion debt in this budget—period. What does this great budget do? It shaves $612 billion off the debt. It has a $1.2 trillion tax increase. It has a $476 billion spending increase. We've got a $1 trillion deficit. We're piling debt as high as the eye can see, and they bring a budget to the floor that is increasing spending?

Let's look at every budget offered by the other side: a $1.2 trillion tax increase by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and a $476 billion spending increase; the Congressional Black Caucus has a $2.8 trillion tax increase with $1.1 trillion spending increase; the Progressive Caucus—that's the doozy of them all—has a $5.7 trillion tax increase with a $4.065 trillion spending increase.

Here is the theme:

Take more money from the economy; take more money from families; take more money from small businesses—spend it in Washington, and hope everything works out.

It's not working out.

Families are struggling because of this borrowing, because of this debt. We need to reject this amendment and go with something that works, and that means balancing the budget to get a healthier economy to create jobs, which is precisely what our budget does.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 2013]

HOW THE HOUSE BUDGET WOULD BOOST THE ECONOMY

(By John F. Cogan and John B. Taylor)

This week the House of Representatives will vote on its Budget Committee plan, which would bring federal finances into balance by 2023. The plan would do so by gradually slowing the growth in federal spending without raising taxes.

Still, the plan has been denounced by naysayers who assert that it would harm the economic recovery and that, at the least, any spending reductions should be put off until later. This thinking is just as wrong now as it was in the 1970s.

According to our research, the spending restraint and balanced-budget parts of the House Budget Committee plan would boost the economy immediately. With the Budget Committee's proposed tax reform included, the immediate impact would be even larger. The entire plan would raise gross domestic product by one percentage point in 2014, equivalent to about a $1,500 increase for each U.S. household. Ten years from now, at the end of the official budget horizon, we estimate that the entire plan would raise GDP by three percentage points, or more than $4,000 for each U.S. household.

Our assessment is based on a modern macroeconomic model (developed with Volker Wieland of the University of Frankfurt and Maik Wolters of the University of Kiel) whose features include a recognition that the resources to finance government expenditures aren't free—they withdraw resources from the private economy. The model provides for other essential attributes of the economy—that consumers, businesses and workers respond to incentives, and they are influenced by their expectation of future economic conditions when making decisions today. None of these features is provided for in old-style Keynesian models.

The House budget plan keeps total federal outlays at their current level for two years. Thereafter, spending would rise each year, but more slowly than if present policies continue. By 2023, federal expenditures would decline to 19.1% of GDP in 2023 from 22.2% today.

Since the Congressional Budget Office projects that revenues will equal 19.1% of GDP in 2023, the House plan will balance the budget that year. Also by 2023, the publicly held federal debt relative to GDP would decline to 55% from its current high level of 76%.

The House budget is hardly austere: The federal spending claim on GDP would still be considerably higher than it was in fiscal 2000 (18.2%) and only slightly below its claim on GDP in 2007 (19.7%).

The reductions in the growth rate of spending are to be achieved primarily through entitlement reforms. The Affordable Care Act would be repealed. Medicaid and food-stamp administration would be turned over to the states. Medicare would be fundamentally reformed. Anti-fraud measures would be applied to federal disability programs. Among the major entitlement programs, only Social Security would remain unchanged; this is a deficiency in the plan. As for discretionary spending, the House budget plan would provide for only slight reductions from the levels that are set by the budget sequester.

The long-run economic gains from restraining government spending would not, despite what critics claim, harm the economy in the short run. Instead, the economy would start to grow right away. Why?

First, the lower level of future government spending avoids the necessity of sharply raising taxes. The expectation that tax rates won't need to rise provides incentives for higher investment and employment today.

Second, since the expectation of lower future taxes has the effect of raising people's estimation of future disposable income, consumption increases today. This change comes thanks to Milton Friedman's famous ''permanent income'' hypothesis that the behavior of consumers reflects what they expect to earn over a long period. According to our macroeconomic model, the higher level of consumption induced by the House budget's effect on consumer expectations is large enough to offset the reduced growth of government spending.

Third, the new budget's reduction in the growth of government spending is gradual. That allows private businesses to adjust efficiently without disruptions.

Still, our macroeconomic model likely underestimates the positive impact of the House budget plan. The model doesn't account for the greater economic certainty that results from preventing the national debt from soaring to dangerously high levels and from stabilizing the federal tax burden. Nor does the model account for beneficial changes in monetary policy that could accompany enactment of the budget plan. Lower deficits and national debt would reduce pressure on the Federal Reserve to continue buying longterm Treasury bonds.

The U.S. economy has been experiencing its slowest recovery from a deep recession in modern history. Tragically, fewer people are working as a percentage of the working-age population than when the recovery began—and economic growth was only 1.6% last year. The large federal budget deficits—by increasing uncertainty and delaying private spending—are an important cause of this lackluster economic performance.

For too long, policy makers have been misguided by models that lend support to bigger government or to the politically convenient objective of delaying any reduction in spending. It is better to recognize the flaws in this approach and get on with the sensible budget reforms the country so sorely needs.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think, if you ask the American people, they know what the challenge is right now. It's getting the economy back in full gear, and they're struggling because too many of them can't find a job, and the Republican budget will make that even worse. That's not me saying it. That's not a Democratic economist saying it. Those are the professionals at the Congressional Budget Office saying it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't have enough time. On your time, I'm happy to, my friend, but I can't do it right now.

Let me say another thing, Mr. Chairman, with respect to balance. It's really interesting.

One of the reasons the Republican budget that last year came into balance in 2040 and the year before was able to balance this year is that the increase in per capita health care costs has come down significantly, in part because of the Affordable Care Act and the changes in incentives. In fact, if you applied much more reasonable assumptions to our proposals than the Congressional Budget Office applied to the Republican budget last year, you'd get balance. I know our Republican colleagues don't want to hear it. Now our focus and our priority is on dealing with the jobs deficit. That is the best way to reduce the long-term deficit and to do it in a balanced way.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished assistant Democratic leader, my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you so much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget.

The Ryan budget ignores the express will of the American people and doubles down on the ''you're on your own'' Republican platform that the voters soundly rejected just a few months ago. Rather than taking a fair and balanced approach to deficit reduction, the Ryan budget will kill millions of jobs, slash needed investments, raise taxes on working families, and create big, new tax breaks for the wealthiest few. The Ryan budget will block grant Medicaid, voucherize Medicare, and rip up the safety net that's at the heart of the social contract in this country. There are many words that can be used to describe the Ryan budget, but the one word that cannot be used is ''balanced.''

I am pleased that the Democratic alternative and the CBC budget that we voted on both include versions of a proposal I have worked on for several years. We call it the ''10–20–30.'' The purpose of the 10–20–30 plan is to target Federal funds to communities that have experienced persistent poverty. Specifically, this proposal targets 10 percent of funding to neglected communities where 20 percent or more of the population has lived in poverty for 30 or more years.

The 10–20–30 plan was originally signed into law as a part of the Recovery Act. It has proven to be successful in steering needed rural development funds into neglected communities for water and sewage and economic development projects. It's time to build on this success and expand the 10–20–30 plan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you.

I am also pleased that all of the Democratic substitutes reject the austerity-for-working-families plan that the Republicans are proposing. Democrats will honor our commitment to senior citizens and invest in a brighter future. The Van Hollen budget will create jobs now, and that's the tried and true way to achieve deficit reduction.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we are stealing from the next generation—our kids and our grandkids. We are making false promises that Medicare and Social Security benefits will be there to take care of folks when we know that Medicare is bankrupt in 8 to 12 years. It's time for Congress to do something to help Americans and their families.

While House Republicans seek to bring taxes and spending back to historically stable levels this country operated under for the past 60 years and seek to balance the budget, there is nothing balanced about the Democrats' plan. We are spending more money today than we did last year, and we are collecting more taxpayer dollars than ever before. Instead of cutting spending, the Democrats' plan would add $4 trillion to the debt and take in another $1.2 trillion out of people's pockets, not to buy down our debt, but to spend even more.

Instead of raising taxes, the House Republican plan includes pro-growth, comprehensive tax reform. Tax reform is critical to increasing U.S. competitiveness abroad as well as attracting business here at home. It will close loopholes and special interest deductions and credits for personal and corporate income taxes and lower the rates for everyone.

I am pleased House Republicans are the only people in this town with the courage to balance the budget. It's time to return the economy to an engine of growth and job creation and to increase opportunities for all hard-working Americans. This is what the House Republican budget will achieve, and this is what Americans deserve.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The way to save Medicare is to bring down costs overall in the health care system, not give seniors a voucher that puts all the risk on the senior, which is what the Republican approach does.

I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, a budget shows our priorities for financial expenditures but our moral priorities as well. There are many reasons to oppose the Ryan budget, but what it does to Medicare and Medicaid are on the top of my list.

They would end Medicare as people have known it. Rather than have a guaranteed benefit, they turn it into a voucher. There would be no guarantee that people would be able to get the services they need and get those benefits provided to them under this voucher. Every year, that voucher would be capped, so they would have to buy a cheaper and cheaper policy with fewer and fewer benefits.

For Medicaid, the Ryan budget cuts $810 billion, ending the coverage for over 70 million Americans: 17 million are seniors or people with disabilities, and 33 million are children, for whom we want to have at least a chance of starting life in the best of health. They would make this into a block grant, cutting $110 billion, shifting the cost on to the States, on to the providers, on to the beneficiaries. They don't hold down costs. They simply shift them.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say that I think that people know over here that we're not proposing a voucher plan. The premium support is quite different, and it's the only bipartisan solution to save and strengthen Medicare.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership as well as to thank all of the members and staff of the Budget Committee.

We have a good product here. It balances. Balance is important because, until you balance, you can't even begin to start paying off this debt, and we do that. The budget that's on the floor right now never balances. It might claim it does, but the math bears otherwise.

□ 1630

I want to address the Medicaid reforms that we put in our budget, because they were just attacked. We believe in balancing the budget. We believe in balancing, not by raising taxes, but by cutting spending. But you don't just have to cut to cut spending. You can reform.

You can reform these programs, Mr. Chair, so that they are around for the generations to come. Medicaid, a program that by all accounts is failing those whom it is intending to serve, needs reform. It leads to poor outcomes for patients.

A 2010 study suggested that surgical patients on Medicaid were 13 percent more likely to die, Mr. Chairman, than those without health insurance at all. That bears repeating. If you're a surgical patient on Medicaid, you are 13 percent more likely to die. That needs reform.

It drives away doctors who want to serve the poor. On average, doctors who participate in Medicaid earn 56 percent of what those in the private sector do. It also is pushing our States closer and closer to the brink of fiscal collapse. States on average now spend more on Medicaid than on any other expense, including K–12 education, Mr. Chairman. And the dramatic expansion of Medicaid under ObamaCare will only make these problems worse.

We have to address these failing programs. The States are doing it already. In Rhode Island, with the help of a waiver from the Federal regulations, they are able to take a cap in spending for 5 years and put everyone in managed care successfully. In my home State of Indiana, 40,000 more people who really needed the care were put on without one more dime of expense.

Mr. Chairman, reform is needed, reform cuts costs, and reform will make sure these programs are around for generations to come. Please do not support this budget. Support the Ryan plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana just made the point that under the current Medicaid system States have lots of flexibility, including Indiana, to help bring down costs. But when you have a tight program, cutting another $820 billion is not a lifeline; it's throwing them an anchor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds simply to say that Indiana is being denied their waivers, so they're being denied the flexibility they are asking for to run Medicaid as they see fit to serve their populations. Point made.

I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the House majority party for putting together a budget that takes a balanced approach. It balances the interest of two very future vulnerable groups.

One is my age, because in 11 years I'm going to be on Medicare and Medicare is going to be broke, completely insolvent, absolutely broke.

At the same time, earlier today, I met with some kids who were here with the Close Up program. They were high school students full of hope. In 11 years, they're going to be starting families, buying cars and gasoline and houses and insurance and raising kids; and they'll be at a financially vulnerable age.

Now, the House Republican budget protects both of us. It makes Medicare solvent for me when I am there and I need the money. And it doesn't do it on the backs of those young high school students today that will be 28-years-old when they need to be raising families and saving for their children's college and their own retirements. It doesn't with the premium support system, not a voucher system, a premium support system, which is what I have as a Member of Congress, where I get to choose from among government pre-approved insurance programs that don't deny me for a preexisting condition. I pay part of the premium and the government pays part of the premium. The healthy and wealthy get less premium support, the unhealthy and unwealthy get more.

It solves both parties. It's the balanced approach. I ask you to reject the minority party's budget and support the House Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished Democratic leader, who just returned from the Vatican and hopefully will bring some hope from the Pope, as I say.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Mr. Chairman, for his tremendous, tremendous leadership and giving us an opportunity in the House today to vote on a budget that is a reflection of American values—values of work and jobs, promoting them, a value of fairness, a value of advancing the success of America's families. I thank him for giving us a budget—I think we can all be the judge—where we say that a budget is a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a Nation is a place where we allocate our resources.

This budget is in stark absolute contrast to the Republican budget that is on the floor today.

Contrast number one: jobs. The Republican bill, the Ryan Republican budget, is a job killer. Nearly 2 million jobs lost right out of the gate, and more lost after that; whereas the Van Hollen Democratic substitute is a job creator. It invests in rebuilding the infrastructure of America. It invests in innovation, energy, and education. Speaking of infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers has given us a D in terms of the condition of the infrastructure in our country. So the need is there. This budget recognizes that need, but it also does so in a way that creates jobs in a very innovative way.

It is in strong contrast when it comes to fairness, fairness as to how we, again, establish our priorities to invest in education, rather than continue to give tax breaks, loopholes that are unnecessary, unworthy of a values budget that the Republican budget continues.

And in terms of our seniors, the contrast could not be greater. The Ryan budget, in 10 years there will be no Medicare guarantee—flat out, absolutely. There will be no Medicare guarantee.

In the meantime—in the meantime—the Ryan budget takes the resources that we have in the health care reform bill, repeals the bill, and takes the money and runs to give it to his priorities, rather than strengthening Medicare and keeping it strong for a longer period of time, keeping the benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act, prevention and wellness services right from the start, closing the prescription drug doughnut hole, and the list goes on.

I listened intently to the gentlelady speak about our high school 18-year-old seniors and where they'll be when they're 28 years old. And since young people are always used as sort of a point of discussion, and rightfully so—we're here to provide for their future—I think it's important to listen to what they have to say.

And the young people that have passed through the Capitol—as you know, many do—I frequently invite them to sit down and tell me what they would like us to say at the table of the discussion of the budget—especially when it comes to them—because we always say we cannot heap mountains of debt on the next generation. I fully agree. That is why I support the Van Hollen budget.

These young people say, We want a strong education system, a strong public education system. We need student loans that are affordable. We need Pell Grants. We need our families to be able to focus on us, and so we need Medicare and Medicaid so that our grandparents' health needs are met.

For a long time to come, they hope, loving their grandparents. But these young people want to be helpful in solving the budget crisis. That's what they have told us: We want to do our share.

The initiative that brings more money to the Federal Treasury is education—education, early childhood, K–12, higher education, post-grad, all the rest of that lifetime learning.

□ 1640

Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than educating the American people, and that is why investing in education, creating jobs, that brings revenue. It's hard to see why we would put forth a budget that stunts the growth of jobs, the growth of our economy with jobs and our investments in education.

On the subject of education, tens of billions of dollars are struck in the Ryan Republican anti-job bill, in that job-killer bill, tens of billions of dollars. They say, it's better to give a tax break to a special interest than to invest in the education of our children.

Would that be a statement of your national values if you were writing a budget for our country? I don't think so. It certainly was not a statement of the values of the young people who have come through here saying how they would help solve the budget deficit challenge we face.

We all know the deficit must be reduced. We've known it for a long time. We've recognized it for a long time. President Clinton recognized it and took us on a path of soundness.

It was totally reversed in the Bush years when our Republican colleagues didn't say a word. They said, no problem; it's the appropriate percentage of GDP. No problem with the deficit. They never complained about it.

But now, with their initiatives, the Ryan Republican job-killer budget is making matters worse in terms of reducing the deficit because it deprives our economy of the very initiatives that would create growth, the education of our people, lifetime learning for the American people.

Investments in education, as I said, nothing brings more money. Investments in jobs, whether it's infrastructure, energy, innovation—absent in the Ryan Republican job-killer budget.

Medicare, so important to the stability of America's working families, the provisions in the Affordable Care Act that affect Medicare have already demonstrated that it is halting the rapid increase in the cost of health care spending, and so that is what has enabled the CBO to say, with more promise, that we can use a different baseline to reduce the deficit, and that has been used in the Republican budget.

So I urge my colleagues to think about the kitchen tables of people in our country. We sit at a table here and have these discussions. What's really important is how the decisions we make here, what we think, and how that relates to the challenges they face, the education of their children, are they going to be able to keep their home, keep their job, keep their pension, all of this heaped one on top of another of concerns.

And the economic and health security of our seniors not only has an impact on them, the seniors, but on their families. And if we're going to be true to those young people, those 18-year olds, we must recognize how important their education is, but also, how important caring for their grandparents is to the economic success of their entire family.

I'll end where I began. The most important part of all of this is this issue of jobs, jobs, jobs, and the fairness in our budget to promote jobs and to reduce the deficit for the success of America's families.

The choice is clear: Job-killer Ryan Republican budget bill, job-creator Van Hollen substitute bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'm just not going to agree with that one, Mr. Chairman. I'll yield myself 30 seconds.

The minority leader says she's concerned about the debt that is befalling the next generation. I'm glad to hear that. Doing nothing, the debt will go up by 56 percent if we just do nothing.

If this budget passes, the Democratic substitute, it will go up by 54 percent. That's basically doing nothing as well.

Jobs: the CBO statistic the gentleman talks about, it's not even an estimate of this budget, it's the sequester.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another 10 seconds.

But the Stanford economist who did look at this Republican budget says that we will create 500,000 jobs in the first year and 1.7 million each and every year by the end of this budget window. Faster economic growth, more jobs, getting the government to live within its means, balancing the budget.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, today we're not talking about balancing a budget for the sake of balancing a budget. The goal is not to just check a box. What we're discussing today is about more than just this procedure of a budget. We're debating the kind of future that we're going to leave our kids.

Today, the choice is clear: if Congress does not get spending under control, our Nation faces a debt crisis that will only make our financial situation worse. House Republicans did recognize this and the urgency of the hour, and we acted.

I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to produce a budget that does make responsible reforms, promotes economic growth and job creation. The House Republican budget does balance in 10 years and gets our Nation back on track.

The Democrats' budget doesn't balance at all within CBO's budget window, and it includes a $1.2 trillion increase in taxes. Our budget reforms the Tax Code and lowers taxes for everyone.

Hardworking Hoosier families sit around their kitchen tables today, tonight, this evening, and make tough choices to keep their budgets. Our households and businesses work hard to live within their means, and the Federal Government should do the same.

The basic principle of keeping budgets is important to all American families. When I'm home in the Second District in the State of Indiana and I'm in the grocery store on Saturday mornings, there are moms that come up to me and they're worried about the rising cost of eggs. They're talking about the price of a gallon of milk.

They're concerned about whether their kids will have a future. Will they really go to college? Will there be jobs for them when they come out of college? Will there be jobs for them if they don't go to college? What happens when they do enter the workforce?

The truth is this: the uncertainty in Washington is what burdens our families at home. It's time for us in Washington to be accountable and pass a responsible budget.

According to Stanford University, in addition to what the chairman mentioned, their economists said that this Republican budget would result in $1,500 more for each household in 2014 and $4,000 more for each household by 2024.

Our budget includes commonsense policies that will spur investments and job creation and roll back the regulations that hurt businesses and stifle economic growth.

History will be our judge by the future that we leave to our children. If we refuse to make responsible, serious decisions about this budget, we'll jeopardize the American Dream for future generations. We have to ensure that our children have the same, if not better, opportunities to succeed than we have.

I urge my colleagues to make a responsible decision, oppose this amendment, and support the House Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I support the Van Hollen budget because it recognizes that reducing our deficit is important, and that fiscal restraint, spending cuts, more revenues in a balanced way, is the way to do that. But I also support it because it chooses American economic growth over the European-style austerity.

Prior to 1965, in this country, when you got old and retired, you moved in with your kids and hoped you didn't get sick. And only the very lucky or the very wealthy got to go to college.

In 1965, two things changed. We adopted Medicare that said that retired people had health security, and we adopted the Higher Education Act that said that sons and daughters of truckdrivers and teachers could get a college education.

What happened?

Prior to 1965, on a per capita basis, our economy grew by $323 per person per year. After 1965, our economy grew by $523 per person per year. Investing in Medicare, investing in education yields growth.

The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantees and will severely raise the cost of going to college for American families. Vote ''yes'' on the Van Hollen plan.

□ 1650

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Little do some know that ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. VAN HOLLEN recently pointed out that Democrats and Republicans both want to get rid of a range of tax loopholes but Democrats want to spend that money and Republicans want to lower the overall burden. That difference is very important.

We have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. That's the principle reason why we're losing American jobs to nations with much lower taxes. As economist Arthur Laffer has warned, there's nothing more portable in this world than money.

This policy might fit the left's ''eat the rich'' crusade, but the jobs it destroys are eating our middle class alive. We are sacrificing permanent, upwardly mobile, productive private sector jobs for makeshift subsidized ones that disappear the moment the money runs out. That is precisely the difference between FedEx and the post office or between Apple and Solyndra. And that's all the difference in the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire again how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The fundamental choice here is whether we want a budget like the Democratic budget that focuses on economic growth and strengthening the middle class or whether you want to take a budget like the Republican budget that imposes European-style austerity by more than doubling the size of the sequester on essential investments to help the economy grow. Investment in our infrastructure, when we know we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry. Investment in our kids' education, not doubling the student loan interest rate in July, as the Republican budget would do. Investment in science and research. If we don't make those investments, our global competitors are going to eat our lunch.

And yes, we do ask the very wealthy to get rid of some of their tax breaks and loopholes to help contribute to the reduction of the deficit so that we can reduce the deficit in a balanced way that calls for shared responsibility. And no, we do not ask middle-income families to pay higher taxes in order to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. And yes, we get the deficit down in a steady way. We balance it in the same year the Republican bill balanced last year, and we don't pretend that we're going to balance and get rid of ObamaCare at the same time. That's fake balance, not real balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this green graph shows you the revenues we've historically had in America. The blue line shows you the tax increases our friends are hoping to achieve, some of which have already occurred. The red line shows you where spending is going. We have a spending problem. But the time my kids are my age, the government will be taking twice as much money to spend on the Federal Government.

Austerity is what you do when you have a debt crisis. You raise taxes and you cut spending on seniors to try and please the bond markets to stop the panic. That's the path we're on. What we're trying to do is prevent austerity.

What do we propose? Let's grow the economy. Let's reform the tax system. Let's stop picking winners and losers through loopholes, lower tax rates for everybody—families and businesses—to create jobs and economic growth. Let's open up the resources we have in this country—oil, coal, and gas—so we can bring down gas prices, increase paychecks, create jobs, help manufacturing.

We have a safety net that isn't working. We have the highest poverty rates in a generation. There are 46 million people in poverty. We need to fix this safety net so it works to get people back on their feet again. We need to save Medicare so that it's not bankrupt—because it is on a path to bankruptcy—so that current seniors can rest in comfort knowing it's not going to be taken away from them, so that the ObamaCare rationing board won't take it from them, and so that those of us who are younger can plan for it.

We need to balance the budget. Balancing the budget is necessary for a healthy economy, for creating jobs, and for giving our kids a debt-free Nation. That's why we do this. Their budget, despite what they say, never, ever balances. The budget the Senate is considering today never, ever balances.

The budget that they're talking about here, the budget that they're passing in the Senate, it actually has a net spending increase. And don't forget the fact that taxes just went up by $1.6 trillion. What do they want to do? Throw another trillion on top. Guess what? They may say it's for the rich. They may say it's for the loophole. Watch out, middle class. The tax man is coming to you. Because that's exactly what all these deficits and all these tax increases are pointing at—taking more out of the paychecks of hardworking families. We're going to balance the budget and stop that from happening. That's why I urge a defeat of the Van Hollen substitute and passage of the base bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I support the Democratic budget. It is a responsible roadmap that invests in our future and approaches deficit reduction in a balanced way. It accomplishes this without singling out domestic energy production with unfair tax provisions.

I cannot support the Republican budget. It cuts taxes for the wealthy and pays for it by raising taxes on middle income earners and betraying our commitment to our seniors. It is misguided and does not reflect the values Americans hold dear.

The Republican budget slashes Medicaid, which provides necessary care to our nation's most vulnerable, especially low-income seniors and children. Denying them the care they need does not make the costs go away, it just shifts the burden on to doctors, hospitals, non-profits, and others.

The Majority budget repeats the same tired and failed tactic of repealing the Affordable Care Act. Repeal increases the deficit and means Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs, receive less preventive care, and bring back the days of abusive insurance companies capping coverage and denying coverage to those with pre-existing conditions.

Alternatively, the Democratic budget makes good on the commitments we have made to our Seniors. It makes sure that the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented and that the benefits are maximized to protect patients and begin to bring down the cost of healthcare. This budget also provides the necessary funding for medical research, which will spur the innovations of the future that end disease and improve outcomes.

Additionally, I appreciate the Ranking Member for making education a top priority in this budget. Investing in education is key to growing our economy, strengthening the middle class, allowing for upward mobility and ensuring our children and grandchildren have brighter futures than previous generations. Robust early education programs, jobs initiatives and financial aid programs to make college more affordable invest in our future and build a stronger America in the long-term. Making it harder for out-of-work Americans to get job training or for families to access quality early learning programs undermines the strength of our workforce and diminishes our ability to compete in the global economy.

Spending on domestic programs is already on track to be at the lowest level as a percentage of the economy since the 1960s, but the Ryan budget would make even deeper cuts. It imposes spending caps on non-defense programs for two additional years at a level that is $700 billion below the level set by the Sequester. It slashes billions of dollars in mandatory funding for Pell Grants and allows interest rates on student loans to double this summer at a time when student loan debt is nearing $1 trillion and is the only type of household debt that continued to rise through the Great Recession. We should be working to help Americans who seek to better their livelihood through higher education rather than allowing them to be crushed by debt or denied access due to skyrocketing costs.

Under the Ryan budget, students will face larger class sizes, more debt, fewer afterschool programs, and less support for special needs. Robust funding for educational investments is critical to growing our economy. Cutting these programs shortchanges our future and threatens the ability of our children to pursue the American Dream.

Finally, I want to thank our Ranking Member on the House Budget Committee and Democratic Leadership for not including provisions in this budget that would unfairly single-out and punish our domestic energy industry by repealing tax provisions for them that are afforded to any business operating in our country. The oil and natural gas industry is one of the largest employers in our country, supporting more than 9.2 million jobs. In fact, this industry delivers $86 million a day to the federal government in revenue. Any changes to these tax incentives should be addressed in the context of comprehensive tax reform and not a budget.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, let me thank our Ranking Member, Congressman VAN HOLLEN.

As a Member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Alternative Budget to the disastrous Republican Budget.

The Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes to raise the critical revenue we need to create 1.2 million new jobs, and make key investments in education, health care and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Alternative not only fully funds the SNAP program, it includes language that calls for the creation of a National Strategy on Poverty.

Democrats understand that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and promote job creation and economic growth.

Finally, the Democratic Budget eliminates off budget spending in the Oversees Contingency Operations slush fund to stop our cycle of perpetual wars and bring our troops home safely.

The Democratic Budget offers a balanced alternative to the failed economic and fiscal policies of the Republican majority.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic Budget.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 253, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—165

Andrews	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Bass	Brady (PA)	Carney
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Castor (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Castro (TX)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Chu

Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—253

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Amodei
Engel
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Schock
Smith (NJ)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1718

Messrs. COFFMAN and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1720

THE NATIONAL FAB LAB NETWORK ACT OF 2013

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013. I introduced this bill because America needs a well-trained workforce for advanced manufacturing.

When I go home, people ask me, Where are the jobs? But when I talk to manufacturing groups like the Tooling & Manufacturing Association in Illinois, they tell me there is a mismatch between job openings and students and workers with the right skills to fill them.

Fab labs can help bridge that skills gap. Fab labs are workshops equipped with computer-controlled machine tools that allow children and adults to build almost anything. The first fab lab was started at MIT, and they have spread worldwide.

My bill would create a Federal charter for a nonprofit organization called the National Fab Lab Network. This chartered status would be similar to that enjoyed by Little League Baseball or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. My bill would help American manufacturers fill job openings and encourage students to become more active in STEM fields, all at no cost to taxpayers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this initiative and to cosponsor the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013.

AMERICA'S NATURAL GAS REVOLUTION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, science is beginning to prevail in the debate over America's natural gas revolution, and it's time to begin telling the real story of what it means for all Americans.

Just 7 years ago, America was facing the fact that we would have to import an increasing amount of natural gas to fulfill our domestic demand. Today, new technologies have enabled us to access previously inaccessible energy resources, and almost overnight America's energy resource picture flipped from deficit to surplus.

In the past 5 years, we've become stronger as a Nation through the development of these God-given resources. As a result, we're more competitive. From the low-income to the high tax brackets, everyone is benefiting.

The future is bright, but only if we educate, dispel myths and half-truths, and begin telling the real story of America's natural gas revolution and what it means to all Americans.

The story is about technology, private sector innovation, investment, financial risks, thousands of new jobs, new competition, new growth, a growing and better standard of living for more Americans, lower energy costs, new industries, a revitalized manufacturing sector, more growth, more jobs, energy security, and optimism. This is the story of America's natural gas revolution.

THE RYAN BUDGET AND MEDICARE

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Ryan budget once again places the burden of deficit reduction on working Americans while failing to stop the frivolous spending of subsidies for oil and gas companies that cost the American people billions of dollars every year.

I'm especially concerned that the Ryan budget will end the guarantee of Medicare for hardworking Americans who have paid into it. Medicare was created precisely because the private market failed to provide seniors with affordable and quality health care.

Even if senior citizens are able to find decent health insurance, they would still have to pay $1,000 more a year for prescription drugs after the Ryan budget reopens the doughnut hole. Overall, their budget will force seniors to pay $59,500 more in health care costs during their retirement. My neighbors, who work so hard to pay their mortgages and send their children to college, can't afford to spend another $59,500.

Rather than ramming through a partisan budget that will never become law, I encourage Congress to work together on a budget that can preserve Medicare, reduce the deficit, and grow our economy.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, I've been talking to my constituents and I've been talking to former patients about the importance of Medicare and how Medicare has impacted their lives, how they've relied on it.

As a doctor, I've taken care of thousands of patients, patients who have worked their whole life paying into a system so that they could rest easy at a time when they needed their health care. They wouldn't have to worry about it.

This is a value and a program that has served millions of Americans for decades. They've come to rely on Medicare. It is a program that works. It is a program that we've come to rely on as doctors.

Let me make it even a little more personal than that. Let me tell you the story about my parents, who came here as immigrants over 50 years ago.

My mom was a public school teacher and my dad was an engineer and a small business owner. They got up every day. They went to work. They paid into a system over a lifetime so that when they needed their health care, they could rest easy. They knew they had a Medicare system.

Let me even make it more personal. Over these past few years, my dad is in his late seventies and he has needed knee replacements. He was able to get them. His doctor was able to order the care that was necessary to take care of him.

A few months ago, my mom suffered a mild stroke. My dad didn't have to hesitate about whether she could get health care or not. My dad could pick up the phone, call 911 and get her to the hospital. She was able to get the care that was necessary that millions of Americans count on. Her doctor was able to come and see her. Her doctor was able to order the postoperative care that was necessary.

□ 1730

That is why millions of Americans rely on Medicare—so they can rest easy at a time when they need that security of health care. It is a system that works. It is a system that working men and women in America pay into over their lifetimes so that, when they're at their most vulnerable, they're able to get the care that they need. I've seen it time and time again as a doctor. Let me share a story with you.

As a young intern in my training as a doctor in internal medicine, one of my first patients was a Roman Catholic priest, Father Mike. It was my first month working in a hospital and doing my rounds in the intensive care unit. Now, Father Mike was afflicted with ALS, more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease. Father Mike would be in and out of the hospital, and would be devastatingly sick. For those of you who know about Lou Gehrig's disease, it is a progressive illness that slowly deteriorates and eats away at your body. It takes away your muscles and your ability to breathe. So, over the course of 2 years, I would see Father Mike repeatedly going in and out of the intensive care unit. He needed that care to keep him alive. Without Medicare, he wouldn't have been able to afford the care.

Now, let's ask ourselves as Americans: What are our values?

Our values are that we take care of our seniors, that we take care of our parents and grandparents, and we want to honor them after a lifetime of work. That is who we are. Those are our morals as Americans, and that is why I'm on the floor of the House of Representatives today to talk about how important Medicare is, not only for my parents but for parents throughout this country, for grandparents throughout this country, and also for that next generation that is currently paying into the system. I'm not alone. My fellow colleagues in medicine care about this deeply.

With that, I would like to recognize my colleague, a fellow physician from California, Dr. RAUL RUIZ.

Mr. RUIZ. Thank you, Dr. BERA.

This Congress has a responsibility and an opportunity to work together to grow our economy and to set this Nation on a fiscally responsible path. However, the Ryan budget is irresponsible, and it places the burden of the deficit on hardworking American families and seniors. This plan ends the guarantee of Medicare. As an ER doctor, I know that many of my senior patients are struggling financially and rely on Medicare in the moments of their lives when they need it the most.

Our priority should be reducing health care costs in order to make Medicare stronger and more sustainable, but this budget transforms Medicare into a voucher program, shifting the costs of health care onto the shoulders of our seniors. We must, once again, work together to protect and preserve Medicare, reduce our deficit and decrease health care costs. I urge my colleagues to come together across party lines and put American families and our seniors first.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you, Dr. RUIZ.

I urge Americans to share their stories. I urge them to share the importance of Medicare and how they rely on it. Share the stories about your parents and grandparents. I urge the Members of this body to share their stories. We all have parents and grandparents. We all care about this program, and we all have stories to tell.

Just today, in my office, I had a colorectal cancer survivor come to visit. She talked about how her cancer was diagnosed early because she was able to go get a colonoscopy—because she was able to get the preventive care services that were necessary. She would not have been able to do that had she not had access to Medicare, had she not had access to basic cancer prevention.

That is what's at stake here—making sure that our seniors, that our parents and grandparents, have access to that care when they need it the most. That's why I'm on the floor here today, because we have to protect Medicare—a program that has worked for decades. It is a program that we rely on, so I want to hear your stories about how we protect Medicare and make sure it's there for generations. This is a program that has worked time and time again. Let me even share another story of patients that I've taken care of.

I've taken care of hundreds of men and women who do physical labor—construction workers, folks who get up every morning and go to work. They don't make a lot of money, but they pay into a system. I'd encourage every American to pull out their paychecks and take a look at them, and you'll see right on there that you're paying into the Medicare system. Even those who are 25 or 30 years old are paying into the system.

Why do we do that?

We pay into the system so that, when we need our health care, we're able to get it. That's what we do as Americans. We know we're in this together, that we care for one another. That is the beauty of Medicare. As I'm working today, I am paying to make sure that my parents and grandparents have the health care they need so that, when I need that health care in retirement, when I'm a senior, I can get it, and so that I can rest easy and not have to worry about that.

That's why we are encouraging you to share your stories. We want to hear your stories about how Medicare has impacted your life and why it is so vital that this body protect Medicare and strengthen Medicare. Share your stories with us on Facebook or Twitter.

I would like to now recognize my colleague, the distinguished gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Congressman.

In listening to your talk, I've been inspired to share this personal story of my mom. I told this story a few minutes ago, but it's worth repeating.

About 20 years ago, my mom had just reached Medicare age. She was a widow on a fixed income, and she was diagnosed with breast cancer. I had a young son at the time. He is grown now, but he was 13 years old. Our family was blessed as my mother had Medicare, and she was able to get the good health care that she needed, and she's still with me today. I didn't have to choose between helping my mother with her health care treatment or saving money to send my son to college.

That's the kind of choice Americans are going to have to make under this Republican budget, because the Republican budget doesn't make seniors healthier, it just shifts the burden.

My district is filled with people from all walks of life, from all different professions, whether they be teachers or nurses or accountants. They've worked hard their whole lives, and they've saved up their Medicare accounts and can live with the comfort now of knowing that, if they get sick or if they get injured, the health care that they've earned will be there for them. They will not be a burden on their children, and they will not take the savings that their children have for their grandkids' college educations and use it for their health care.

But it's not enough, Congressman BERA, for us just to say that the Republican budget is bad, because the fact of the matter is the American people and my constituents want answers. They want us to be problem solvers, not problem creators, and they want us to get something done. The Democratic budget gets something done. Just on this issue of health care for our seniors, we secure Medicare for this generation and for generations to come because we focus on what the problem is, and that has been the growing costs of health care.

□ 1740

In the Affordable Care Act, we tackle the problem directly. We reduce overpayments to health care insurance carriers. We look for efficiencies in the delivery of health care. We focus on prevention. We make health care more accessible to more people so that when they enter their Medicare ages, they're healthier. The Democratic budget has a solution, a solution to a challenge that all Americans recognize today.

Congressman BERA, I want to thank you for allowing me to spend some time to speak on behalf of not only my family, but so many of the families in my district in south Florida who depend on Medicare to live full lives.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you, Congresswoman FRANKEL.

You know, I look at this whole issue from the eyes of a doctor. That's how I have to, that's how I was trained as a doctor. One of the first rules we take when we are sworn in as doctors, the oath and the promise that we make is to do good, benevolence. That is core to what we do, and that is core to what this body needs to understand.

This is not about Republicans versus Democrats. We need to come together to do good for our parents and grandparents, to do good for our seniors, to make sure that we honor the promise that we made to them that after a lifetime of work that they would be able to get the care when they needed it the most. That they could rest easy and not have to worry about getting the care that they needed.

Those are American values. Those aren't Democrat versus Republican. We need to start setting aside that partisanship. And as to the oath I took when I became a doctor and was sworn into the field of medicine, we need to do good. We need to have the courage to put our patients and American citizens first. That is what this is about. That is why I'm on the floor today talking as a doctor about the patients that I've cared for.

Now, I've heard from others that I represent. Tina shared a story with me. Her father died a few weeks ago after spending a month in the hospital.

Medicare meant her family never had to worry about what the cost of his care was during his illness. Medicare meant that her mother doesn't have to live a life in bankruptcy now, that she could rest easy that her husband was able to get the care that he needed. Medicare meant that they knew in her father's last days that he was getting good health care, that his doctors were able to give him the care that was necessary at the end of his life.

Tina has urged me to fight every day to make sure that every family has the same peace and the same support and the same security that her family had and that she felt at a time when her father needed the care. That's what this is about. This is about doing what we do as Americans. We care for one another. We build a system where we're all in this together, where those of us who are working are paying into a system over a lifetime so that the seniors of today are able to get that care and that we pay it forward. Those are our values. Those are American values, and it's not Democrat versus Republican; and we have to get past this.

As we are on this floor, as we're making votes, we have to think about those who came before us, our parents, our grandparents, the seniors who built this country. That is who we are as Americans, and that's why we want to hear your stories about why Medicare is so important. Share those stories with us on Facebook. Share those stories with us on Twitter. Let your Representatives know why it is so important you want us to keep fighting for Medicare every day.

I'd now like to actually hear a story from my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congressman BERA. What a great opportunity for me to tell my story when I think about Medicare and what that means to me—but more importantly, what it means to this Nation, what it means to the citizens in the Third Congressional District that I represent, what it means to someone's mother, someone's grandmother, someone's spouse.

Medicare is something that was created and seniors have paid into it, oftentimes for a lifetime. And then they get to a point in their life when they want to be able to use something that they paid into. Medicare is something that you're going to hear about from people.

I agree with my colleagues that Medicare is not, nor should it be, a Democrat or a Republican issue. It should be something when you think about being able to provide health care for the same individuals who put so much money into it that they can now be able to use it. Medicare helps save lives. Medicare is part of what I think of as part of the American Dream. Medicare is something that we should be proud to be able to say that we're going to take care of our seniors.

You see, a few years ago my father was very ill; but it was because of Medicare that I was able to witness him getting quality health care. I'm fortunate, my mother is still living. And like many of my colleagues who have come here today and talked about the wonderful benefit that they had by being able to know that their parent was being taken care of, and they were going to be able to have quality health care, isn't that something that we all want? Isn't that something we want as a Democrat? Isn't that something that we want as a Republican?

Let me tell you what I know the citizens of the Third Congressional District want. Let me tell you what I really believe the citizens of this wonderful country we live in want. I think they want to see us working together. I think they want to hear solutions. I think they want to know that they can trust us, because they sent us here not to be in gridlock, not for us to be fighting, not for us to be arguing without resolve, and that's what Democrats are saying to you today.

We have taken this issue that touches lives and reaches across America, and we are saying it is our responsibility as Members of Congress, Members of this 113th Congress, that we should make it one of our key responsibilities to stand on this floor and tell those stories, to tell those stories about Medicare, to tell those stories about the lady who lives down the street from me and how fortunate she was because Medicare saved her life. We should be able to stand on this floor and give speech after speech to say to America: you sent us here to protect those who are the most fragile citizens, those who have given so much that we stand here.

So you see, my story is quite simple about Medicare. It's about exercising our right to protect those who paved the way for us. It's about me saying proudly as a Democrat our alternatives to the budget as it relates to Medicare is the best solution. It's about saying we should not make it a voucher program. It's about me saying we should not take moneys from Medicare and give to other companies that don't need it.

You see, it's quite simple. It's a story about saving lives. It's a story about doing all the things that we say as public servants. It's about the oath that we took as an elected official that we would serve our communities, that we would come here and make a difference.

□ 1750

So, Congressman BERA, for me, it's about standing strong and saying to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Join us; join us in making a difference to help our seniors and protect and save Medicare. And that's my message and my story.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you to my colleague from the great State of Ohio.

That's why we are asking folks today to share their stories. We would love to hear your story about how Medicare has affected you or a family member or a friend. Share it on Facebook or Twitter. We want to hear those stories. This body needs to hear those stories. This body needs to make sure, when we're taking votes, we're voting understanding those stories.

As a doctor, I took an oath to do good, to do no harm. Well, if Medicare becomes a voucher program, it will do irreparable harm to thousands of Americans, and that is not what we need.

The reason why I'm on the floor today is to talk about the good that Medicare has done for millions of Americans. Americans, like another one of my constituents, Pat. She shared with us a story.

Pat was a single mom. She worked hard her whole life and raised two kids on her own. Pat is now 77 years old. She has high blood pressure, diabetes, and heart disease. She had to have open-heart surgery and afterwards was prescribed very expensive medications and cardiac rehabilitation. She had to get back on her feet because she wanted to be with her family.

There's no way Pat could have afforded that surgery if she didn't have Medicare. There's no way Pat could have afforded the medications that she needed if she didn't have Medicare. There's no way that the doctors that cared for Pat would have been able to prescribe the therapies that she needed to keep her alive. That is what's at risk here.

This is about protecting our seniors, making sure that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime of paying into a system, that they can rest easy; that they don't have to worry about whether they can get the health care that they need when they need it the most, they can rest easy.

That's why we want to hear your stories. Please share your story about how Medicare has impacted your life or your family's life on Facebook or Twitter.

I would now like to yield to my dear friend and colleague from the great State of California, my home State, Mr. HONDA.

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank my friend, Dr. AMI BERA, for allowing me to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to dispel the oft repeated notion that Medicare is somehow the problem in the current fiscal crisis. Republicans have, in budget after budget, attempted to voucherize the program and end the Medicare guarantee as we know it. They would break the promise we made to our Nation's seniors decades ago, one in which we told hardworking middle class Americans that if they paid in through their wages and trusted in their government that they would be taken care of.

Medicare is the most efficient health plan in our country. It has a 2 percent overhead. Let me repeat that. It has a 2 percent overhead. More efficient than any private plan.

The problem isn't Medicare. The problem is the rising cost of health care and what it is we have to do to get that under control. It's a cost that has gone up exponentially in our country compared to the rest of the world.

Republicans want to do nothing about the real problem of rising costs. Rather than tackle the hard issue, they want to shift the costs on to seniors, people like my mom. She's 96 right now, and she depends on that important program.

Six years ago, she had to be checked up for a heart condition. She had had an aneurysm below her diaphragm and it was part of the arterial system. They said that it would be difficult to solve and that they would have to provide a stent because of her age, as she was 70 at that time.

Well, a few years later, that aneurysm grew a little larger, and it became pretty critical that, if nothing was done, she would die. The doctors looked at her again at the advanced age of 90 and concluded that we could do this with her—she walked around acting like she was 70—and would have a 9 out of 10 chance of survival. If she did not do anything, the chance of survival would have been a lot less.

My mom thought about it, she pondered about it, and she said, I'm 90. I've lived a good life. Let's take this 9 out of 10 chance. And she put her faith not only in the hands of the doctors and the system, but also in the hands of her God. After a few hours of operation, she came out, and it was successful.

But none of this could have been possible without Medicare. We would not have been able to afford it, and neither could she have afforded it.

She grew up as a child of a businessman during prewar United States, and in her adult life as my mom, she worked as a domestic, so she had no pension plan. She had no other plans that would help her in her old age, except Medicare.

So, time and time again, when Congress was looking for an easy way out in dealing with these issues, leaving folks like my mom holding the bag, this whole issue is personal. And I'm sure that this is a story that could be shared by almost every family in this country in one way or another when we think about Medicare. So, having the middle class Americans and people like my mom holding the bag is absolutely unacceptable. It is wrong and it is quite cowardly.

One of the major reasons why our health care costs keep going up is because we have not changed the way patients and doctors see each other. We must be innovative and creative in tackling the traditional costs of health care.

As a Representative covering Silicon Valley, I have helped lead the way in this by promoting innovative technologies, such as telemedicine, personal health connected devices, and other tools. I will be reintroducing the Health Care Innovation and Marketplace Technologies Act later this year to continue this effort. Let's hope that folks on the other side will understand its importance.

Most importantly, however, I will continue to stand with my friends here in the Chamber tonight to protect Medicare and the Medicare guarantee. We can fix our Nation's fiscal House by being innovative, rather than using the same old ideology. We can improve our Nation's standing by being courageous and standing by our Nation's seniors.

Mr. BERA of California. I thank my dear friend and colleague from California, Congressman HONDA.

The reason why we are here today, the reason why we are speaking on the floor today, is because of the importance of Medicare. This isn't a Democratic or a Republican issue. This is an issue that affects all Americans. It's an issue that is dear to all Americans, to all American families. It isn't Democratic or Republican.

□ 1800

That's why I'm wearing this pin that says, ''No Labels.'' Because we've got to move past these labels, Democrat versus Republican, and think about what our values are as Americans—the values of making sure we take care of our parents and grandparents, that we honor the foundation that they built for us, that those that came before us built; that we honor, after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, that they can rest easy, that they know they can get the health care that they need when they need it the most.

That's why we want you to share your stories with us about how Medicare has impacted you personally or your family. I think about this and the thousands of patients that I've taken care of, and what Medicare has meant to them; how it saved millions of lives, how it's kept millions of families from falling into poverty because they were able to get the health care that was necessary when they needed it the most.

Another one of my constituents, Katherine, shared a story with us recently. Katherine had a sister who was diagnosed with lung cancer and chronic lung disease. At first, she was hesitant. She was a little bit worried about using her Medicare because she didn't want to be a burden. She wanted to be independent. But she looked at it and she realized she had paid into this system her whole life and was grateful that it was there for her. She realized that she wasn't being a burden and that this is the system that she had paid into, and it was there for her. Medicare covered her bills and kept her alive. That's why we're here on the floor today talking about Medicare.

When I talk about this, it's personal. I talk about this as a doctor. I talk about this as a son whose parents are aging. I think about the people who live in my neighborhood, like my neighbor, Jerry. He's a widower. His wife passed away several years ago. Jerry's also a cancer survivor. He has to go in for routine blood transfusions and routine care. He doesn't have to worry about whether he can get that care or not because of Medicare. Because he paid into the system his whole life, now he can get the care that he needs.

Millions of families across this country depend on Medicare. That's why we're here talking about protecting Medicare. And that's why we want to hear your stories about how Medicare has impacted your life. I would love to here those stories and want you to share them on Facebook or Twitter. Medicare allows patients that I've seen—patients with diabetes, with high blood pressure, with high cholesterol—to get the medications that they need. Medicare allows me as a doctor to write those prescriptions and know that my patients are able to get the care that they need.

Medicare is not about Democrats versus Republican. It is about doing the honorable thing that we do as Americans. Because that's who we are. Those are our values as Americans. As Americans, we want to make sure that after a lifetime of work, we're going to protect the promise that we made to our parents and grandparents. And I know it's not Democrats versus Republican because you can see it in that picture of when the Tea Party first emerged in this country in 2009. They were holding up their signs saying, ''Keep your hands off of our Medicare.'' You know what? I'd say the same thing.

As we go through these budget debates, let's keep our hands off of Medicare. Yes, we've got to address the cost of health care. But as my colleague, Congressman HONDA shared, Medicare works extremely well. It's a program that has worked for decades. It is a program that has allowed me as a doctor and has allowed countless doctors across this country to deliver the necessary care when we needed to and to do what we were trained to do—to be doctors.

That is why I'm on the floor today talking about how we protect that promise that we made to our parents and grandparents, and how we protect and honor the promises that we've made. Yes, we face challenges in this country. Yes, we have to address our debt and deficit. And we have to build for the future so our children grow up in the same vibrant world that we grew up in with a country that's leading the way. But we can't do that by breaking a promise that we made to our parents and grandparents. We can't do that on the backs of seniors, taking care away from them when they need it the most.

This has to be bipartisan. Because how we treat our elders, how we treat our parents and grandparents, is a direct reflection of who we are as Americans. We need to start talking about this in a bipartisan way. We need to shelve the idea of dismantling Medicare and we have to talk about the idea of strengthening Medicare, making it more secure so that it is there not only for today's seniors but that it is there for the generations, that it is there for our children and grandchildren. It is a system that works extremely well.

Yes, we have to talk about the cost of health care. We have to address the cost of health care. But Medicare isn't the problem. Medicare works extremely well. Ask any senior. Eighty percent of seniors love Medicare. They don't want to see it changed. They don't want to see this body messing around with Medicare. They want us to strengthen it, and they understand that we have to deal with the cost of health care. But the system of Medicare has delivered care extremely well.

That's why I'm on the floor asking you to share your Medicare story. I'm asking you to share that story on Twitter or share it through Facebook. Because this body needs to hear those stories. This body needs to understand that Medicare is a vital program for millions of seniors, that our parents and grandparents depend on this program, and that our doctors and our hospitals depend on Medicare.

Now is not the time to be talking about dismantling Medicare. Now is the time to be talking about how we strengthen Medicare, how we make sure it's there for the generations. That's why I'm on the floor today, as a doctor but also as a son whose parents rely on Medicare. That's why I want to hear your stories, and I want you to share your Medicare story on Facebook or Twitter.

I now yield to my great friend and colleague from the great State of Oregon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I want to thank my colleague from California for being here this evening, for sharing the time, allowing me to speak with him. And I must say how excited I was that a friend who actually had a rewarding career was willing to jump into the political fray, which has been difficult at times, particularly as we've had the contentious issues surrounding health care, and that you would be willing to bring your expertise, time, and energy when you had other choices with your life and career. We really appreciate it. Because the experience you have had in the medical profession, the years of study, the actual experience with real-life people adds a dimension that is helpful here in ways that I don't know that you fully appreciate, but I certainly do. I also appreciate focusing on the critical nature of Medicare and where we're going in the world of health care reform.

I just spent last week dealing with my Republican friends' approach to the budget. It can only be described as an exercise in fantasy.

□ 1810

They start with the notion that somehow they're going to eliminate ObamaCare entirely; and they seek to transfer the burden of Medicare and Medicaid from the government onto the shoulders of some of America's most vulnerable poor and disabled, and our senior citizens. I really appreciate your focusing on the importance of Medicare in providing dignity and stability to millions of Americans.

Now, I think there have been, between the House and the Senate, about 50 efforts or more to repeal the health care reform. I must say I hope that finally people get it out of their system. I was surprised that we went in this direction, to turn Medicare into a voucher, a block grant for Medicaid, and put this burden on our senior citizens and some of our poor and disabled Americans, because this was the centerpiece of their campaign for the last 6 months. This was part of what our friend PAUL RYAN and Governor Romney preached from coast to coast, advertised, campaigned; and all of a sudden it was rejected by the American public overwhelmingly. The President was comfortably reelected. In fact, there were more Democratic Senators added who support this effort. In the House of Representatives, not only did we gain seats, but more than a million voters—more voted for Democrats than Republicans.

So you would think that this canard would be put to rest; but it is important for people to know that it is still a viable option as far as our Republican friends are concerned. It's unfortunate because we are making some progress in reforming the health care system—not by turning our back on Medicare, not by transferring the risk and responsibility to seniors and the most vulnerable, but by making it more efficient, by taking some of the experiments that we've done in my home State of Oregon—and as you well know there are some health care systems in California that have already found ways to reward value over volume, to be able to extend care, and do so more efficiently, and squeeze the approximately one-third to 40 percent or more of our health care spending that is wasted.

We can do a better job. We start, I think, by protecting Medicare. We start by recognizing that a voucher—or premium support, or whatever they call it—that caps the investment does nothing to reform health care; but, instead, it puts seniors and our most vulnerable citizens out navigating the health care maze with fewer resources and more responsibility and actually making it harder. Because that's why we have Medicare in the first place. The private market did a terrible job meeting the needs of America's oldest and least healthy population.

I am hopeful that we're going to be able to continue this effort that you're spearheading here tonight, for people to understand the opportunities to continue reform, to note that we are actually seeing a gradual stabilization of health care spending right now, and that there are things in the hopper that we can do going forward without taking advantage of people who deserve the security of a solid, reformed health care system, not one that the Federal Government vouchers and turns their back.

I would yield back to the gentleman if there are comments. I look forward to hearing what you have to say, and perhaps there may be a little more interaction if it's useful.

Mr. BERA of California. Well, I appreciate my friend and colleague from the great State of Oregon.

We've heard wonderful stories from all across this country tonight as my colleagues have shared their experience with Medicare, personal stories about what Medicare has meant to their parents. We want to hear your stories as well. Your Representatives on both sides of the aisle need to hear your stories of what Medicare means to you personally and to your families. Because Medicare is a promise that we've made to our parents and grandparents, to millions of seniors across this country. It is a promise that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, you can rest easy. You don't have to worry about whether you'll be able to get the health care that you need at a time when you need it the most.

This can't be a partisan issue. It can't be Democrats versus Republicans. Because we're all sons and daughters. We all think about our seniors. Those are our values as Americans. It isn't who we are as a Nation. We respect our elders. That's how we were raised.

As a doctor, we rely on the importance of Medicare. We rely on the ability that at a time when our patients are at their most vulnerable, when they need health care, that I can write that prescription, that I can do the treatment or order that surgery when it's needed. That is the promise that we've made, and that's why we're here fighting every day.

I urge this body, and I urge my colleagues, as we are looking to address the challenges of this Nation, we acknowledge and understand that Medicare is not one of those challenges. Medicare is one of the success stories of America. Medicare is a success story that has kept millions of Americans healthy and alive and giving them the care that they need.

Yes, we face challenges. Yes, we have to address the cost of health care. But Medicare is a success story, and it is something that we should be celebrating every day. That isn't Democrat versus Republican; that is a success story of this body, and let's celebrate that.

With that, I'll yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Dr. BERA.

I appreciate your focus on this and pointing out that this is something that shouldn't be a partisan issue, doesn't have to be a partisan issue, and it is in fact a success story that has made a huge difference in the lives of seniors from coast to coast. It's helped, in many cases, stabilize what's happened in terms of local health care economics.

The pattern that we have seen in escalating health care costs for the last 40 years, yes, there are concerns about health care as it relates to Medicare; but if you compare the rate of increase of private health insurance versus the rate of increase in Medicare, Medicare spending has not gone up as rapidly as what's happened with the private insurance sector.

No senior citizen under Medicare needs to go bankrupt because of medical costs. The security that you mentioned, I find it embarrassing and shameful that the United States is the only major country in the world where there are still people going bankrupt for health care costs. Half of all bankruptcies are a result of health care emergencies. It doesn't have to be this way, and it is not that way for American seniors.

But if we're going to change our health care commitment to our senior citizens, taking away the guarantee of Medicare, flinging people into an uncertain private market that failed them in the past, which is why we had Medicare in the first place, that guarantee is not certain to be there.

No one thinks that we shouldn't have a health care system with a Medicare that is flexible going forward. We're open to reforms, absolutely. We want to reward value instead of volume. We want to be able to deal with the pattern of unnecessary medical readmissions for Medicare patients after they've been in the hospital. It's too high still.

□ 1820

But we are working on mechanisms in Medicare and with the hospitals to be able to reward keeping them out of the hospital with preventable conditions that require readmission.

We're in the process of looking at Medicare Advantage, which is growing dramatically. I come from the district that has probably the highest penetration of Medicare Advantage in the entire country, and it serves in many cases my constituencies pretty well, but there are wide variations across the country in Medicare Advantage. Not all Medicare Advantage programs are created equal.

Again, part of what we've done with the Affordable Care Act is not to turn our backs on potential opportunities to improve it, but to dive in and find ways to reward the most efficient and effective Medicare Advantage programs and, frankly, reduce the support for programs that aren't measuring up. That's what we should be doing.

We are moving in this direction. We don't have to take away the commitment that we have made to America's seniors to improve Medicare, Medicare Advantage, to be able to get even more value out of the system—not just tax dollar savings—but better quality care for our senior citizens, which should be our objective.

I know, Doctor, that is something you've practiced both as an elected official and as a professional; and I deeply appreciate it.

Mr. BERA of California. I genuinely appreciate my colleague from the great State of Oregon sharing these stories and the hard work that you've done on this.

I know I'm coming up on the end of my time, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about Medicare as a doctor and as a son and talk about the success of Medicare. It's something that we should be celebrating.

I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues to hear their stories of how Medicare has impacted their lives, to work with them to strengthen Medicare, to make sure it is there, not only today, but it is there for the next generation and that it is stronger.

We can do this. We know how to do it. Over the coming weeks and the coming months, as we address our challenges, I'll be coming to this floor to share those stories and those ideas of how we move forward as a Nation and how we move forward as Americans making sure we honor the promise that we've made, that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, that our parents and grandparents, that our seniors can get the care that they need.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2008

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 933, CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment; the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read; the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

771. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Declaration of Prion as a Pest Under FIFRA; Related Amendments; and Availability of Final Test Guidelines [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0427; FRL-9372-7] (RIN: 2070-AJ26) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

772. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0302; FRL-9377-6] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpyrazamine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0357; FRL-9373-9] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1002; FRL-9379-6] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0308; FRL-9379-9] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tetrachlorvinphos; Extension of Time-Limited Interim Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0360; FRL-9380-9] (RIN: 2070-AZ16) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

777. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

778. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General James N. Mattis, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

779. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Economic Development Conveyances Report to Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

780. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2012 report on the Military Retirement Fund (MRF); to the Committee on Armed Services.

781. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting Buy American Act Report for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filings Required of Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Related Entities (RIN: 1210-AB51) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

783. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders — Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (RIN: 1210-AB48) received March 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

784. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''The Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Program Activities Report for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

785. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Evaluation Findings — Performance Improvement 2011-2012 report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

786. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Amendments to the HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014 [CMS-9964-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR74) received March 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

787. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Delaware Portion of the Philadelphia Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0141; FRL-9786-4] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

788. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Identification of Additional Qualifying Renewable Fuel Pathways under the Renewable Fuel Standard Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0542; FRL-9686-3] (RIN: 2060-AR07) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Federal Implementation Plan for Oil and Natural Gas Well Production Facilities; Fort Berthold Indian Reservation (Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation), North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0479; FRL-9789-3] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program; Clarification of EPA's Approval of the Sunland Park Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-NM-0006; FRL-9788-8] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

791. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New York: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R02-RCRA-2013-0144; FRL-9693-2] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

792. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Idaho [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0640, FRL-9791-2] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

793. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Consent Decree Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0650; FRL-9789-9] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

794. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Cleveland-Akron-Lorai and Columbus 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revisions to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0884; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0970; FRL-9790-2] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

795. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Control Techniques Guidelines and Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0448; FRL-9791-1] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

796. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to Ambient Nitrogen Dioxide Monitoring Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0486; FRL-9789-2] (RIN: 2060-AR59) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

797. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on ''Overseas Surplus Property'' for disposal within fiscal years 2013 through 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

798. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Report on Workforce Planning for Foreign Service Personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

799. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting authorizing the implementation of certain sanctions set forth in the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

800. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting authorizing the implementation of certain sanctions set forth in the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

801. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 relating to the top five exporting and importing countries of pseudoephedrine and ephedrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

802. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

803. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

804. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting ninth and final lessons learned report entitled ''Learning from Iraq''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

805. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on the No FEAR Act for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

806. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Information (RIN: 3245-AG26) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

809. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services (RIN: 3245-AG27) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

810. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Compensation, Retirement Programs, and Related Benefits; Effective Dates (RIN: 3052-AC41) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Small Business and Science, Space, and Technology.

811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report concerning the operations and status of the Government Securities Investment fund (G-Fund) of the Federal Employees Retirement System during the debt issuance suspension period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 83481(1); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1275. A bill to guarantee the right of individuals to receive Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in full with an accurate annual cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1277. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1278. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 regarding the disparagement of Native American persons or peoples through marks that use the term ''redskin'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1279. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to issue up to 10,500 E-3 visas per year to nationals of the Republic of Korea (South); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1280. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to increase the penalties imposed for intimidating, threatening, or coercing any person from engaging in voter registration activities or for procuring, submitting, or casting false voter registration applications or ballots, to require election officials to transmit voter registration cards and absentee ballots to voters in elections for Federal office through the use of the automated tagging and tracing services provided by the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 1281. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1282. A bill to reduce housing-related health hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for grants to small business development centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 1284. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel for certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make any substance containing hydrocodone a schedule II drug; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1286. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1287. A bill to ensure high standards for Federal agency use of scientific information; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROSS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1288. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1289. A bill to provide a Federal charter to the Fab Foundation for the National Fab Lab Network, a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing community access to advanced manufacturing tools for learning skills, developing inventions, creating businesses, and producing personalized products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JONES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HURT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1290. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1291. A bill to reauthorize the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 1292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that wages paid to unauthorized aliens may not be deducted from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1294. A bill to establish a program that will generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments containing National Forest System land through a management-focused approach, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAFFEI (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 1296. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify a maintenance exemption regarding the removal of sediment, debris, and vegetation from certain structures; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to expand eligibility for Farm Service Agency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend the Export Apple Act to permit the export of apples to Canada in bulk bins without certification by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1299. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain public land currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army for inclusion in White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1301. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1302. A bill to prohibit foreign military financing to Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1303. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1304. A bill to permit the chief executive of a State to create an exemption from certain requirements of Federal environmental laws for producers of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1305. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1306. A bill to provide for the partial settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1307. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to require the Bureau of Land Management to provide a claimant of a small miner waiver from claim maintenance fees with a period of 60 days after written receipt of 1 or more defects is provided to the claimant by registered mail to cure the 1 or more defects or pay the claim maintenance fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MICA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H. Res. 130. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz and acknowledging the Cyrus Cylinder as a symbol of respect for human rights and religious tolerance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

4. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress and the President to restate that the congressional intent of the federal Controlled Substances Act is not to prohibit the production of industrial hemp; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8—The Congress shall have Power To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause I—The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—The Congress shall have power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 1281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power to enact this legislation is granted in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Civil Rights Enforcement

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 1290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and under Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 1294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 1295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 1301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

Also, the Tenth Amendment—

The powers not Delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 35: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 69: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 125: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 164: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 207: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 258: Mr. PALAZZO and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 261: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 292: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 303: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 318: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 324: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. Lynch, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 334: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 337: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 351: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 360: Mr. LONG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. McCarthy of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YODER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 362: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 363: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 384: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 386: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 454: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 474: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 479: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 485: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 506: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 519: Ms. BASS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 523: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 525: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 532: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 540: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 541: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 556: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 569: Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 570: Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 571: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 572: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 574: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 580: Mr. STEWART and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 612: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 627: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 630: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 637: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 638: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 641: Mr. ENYART and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 647: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. YOHO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 675: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 678: Mr. DAINES and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 724: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 729: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 730: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 735: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 736: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 772: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 792: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 794: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 795: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 801: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 806: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 807: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 819: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HURT, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 846: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 847: Mr. WELCH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 849: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 850: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 851: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 853: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 855: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 864: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 874: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 879: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 894: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 895: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 896: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 904: Mr. UPTON and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 916: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 920: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 940: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 949: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 961: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 979: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 986: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1000: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1014: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1015: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1018: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1026: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1029: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1030: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1033: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1038: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1039: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1063: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1081: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1089: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1091: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1097: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1101: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1120: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1125: Mr. YOHO and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1149: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1151: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 1172: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1202: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1204: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1209: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1219: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1242: Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1252: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1265: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. MULLIN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H. Res. 69: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 89: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 90: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 94: Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 98: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 104: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 108: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Res. 110: Mr. AMASH.

H. Res. 112: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. JONES, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.